

School of Theology at Claremont



10011463169



The Library
of the
CLAREMONT

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

823
RG
1894

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

etc. 12

ITS FORM, MEANING AND PURPOSE

ACCORDING TO

THE APOSTLE PAUL.

BY

WILLIAM ROBSON.

'The light within me, that is, my reason and conscience, does assure me that the ancient and Apostolic faith . . . is solid and true.'

HENRY MORE.

SECOND EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.

LONDON :

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1894.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

THE LORD'S SUPPER;

*ITS FORM, MEANING, AND PURPOSE, ACCORDING TO
THE APOSTLE PAUL.*

CHAPTER I.

Paul's definition of 'the body of Christ' and application of the definition to 1 Cor. x. 16.—Meaning of the word 'koinonia' and 'breaking of bread.'

So far as our present knowledge extends, the Apostle Paul was the first, and indeed the only writer of his age, who put together in literary composition the words 'σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ,' 'the body, or external manifestation, of Christ.' Neither the phrase, nor the idea expressed in it, is found in any other Apostolic writer of the New Testament. As a matter of common-sense, therefore, we must look to St. Paul alone for his meaning of the words. Fortunately for us, he leaves no room for doubt upon this point. He specially and fully defines the phrase in every Epistle in which it is found; viz., in the Epistle to the Romans, in the First to the Corinthians, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and, lastly, in that to the

Colossians. And these several definitions are so full and exact, and so thoroughly agree with each other, as to leave no room for doubt as to the propriety of its uniform application to all other passages in his writings, in which the associated words are found.

We will take the definitions in their respective order.

In the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle writes 'Even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office, so we, the many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another' (xii. 4, 5).

In his First Epistle to the Corinthians, he expresses the same idea several times: 'Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ? . . . and he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit' (vi. 15, 17). And farther on we find almost the same words as we have already quoted from the Epistle to the Romans: 'For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is the Christ' (xii. 12). And the Apostle continues: 'For in one spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jew or Greek, whether bond or free, and we were all made to drink of one spirit.'*

And after describing through the next thirteen verses the agreement and perfect unity of different members of the human body, in their various relationships to each other as parts of one complete organism, he winds up the illustration with this emphatic application to the Corinthian Church: 'Now ye are "a

* He repeats this in his Epistle to the Galatians, chap. iii. 26-28.

soma of Christ"—an external manifestation of the Spirit of Christ—"and members of the "soma," each in his part,' *i.e.*, according to the service he fulfils in it.

In his Epistle to the Ephesians, certainly one of the last, if not the last, of the Apostle's literary works, and that which may be regarded as his legacy to the Universal Church, this idea of the Church being the body of Christ, and individual members of the Church members of that body, may be said to permeate the whole. This is the central idea of the Epistle, round which gather and culminate all the hopes, privileges and duties of the Christian disciple. But our present object is simply to bring into review those passages in which the Apostle defines his own peculiar phrase, 'σῶμα του Χριστοῦ,' 'body of Christ.'

Our first quotation is from the first chapter, beginning with the seventeenth verse: 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory . . . when He raised the Christ from the dead, made Him sit at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and all authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the CHURCH, which is HIS BODY, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.'

The whole of the second and third chapters are devoted to a description of the privileges and blessings involved, and bound up in this Divine relationship of the believer to Christ. In the fourth chapter he connects all the duties of discipleship with this

relation, as their common source. Thus, 'There is one body and one Spirit' (ver. 4). And he goes on to say that all the gifts vouchsafed to the different orders of men in the Church, 'whether apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors or teachers, were all given for the end of the building up of the body of the Christ . . . that the disciple may grow up in all things *into* Him who is the Head, even Christ; from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love' (vers. 12, 15, 16).

In the fifth chapter the Apostle deduces from this union of Christ with His Church the relative duties of husband and wife, 'because we are members of HIS BODY' (ver. 30), and adds that the original promise connected with marriage, that the two so conjoined shall become one flesh (vers. 30-32), has its fulfilment in the relation of Christ to the Church.

In the Epistle to the Colossians, the Apostle pursues the same line of thought; but what he describes in the Epistle to the Ephesians as springing out of the mystery of the Divine will—'the reunion under one head of all things in the Christ'—is here more directly spoken of as a 'new creation.' 'In Him were all things created. . . . He is before all things, and in Him all things are held together, and He who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, is the Head of the BODY, the CHURCH, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence' (chap. i. 16-18).

Again, in verse 24, the Apostle says: 'I rejoice

in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of the Christ in my flesh, on behalf of HIS BODY, which is THE CHURCH, of which I was made a minister.'

And again in chap. ii. 16, 17, he says: 'Let no man judge you in meat, or drink, or in respect of a feast-day, or a new moon, or a Sabbath day, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body' (in contrast with the shadow) 'is *the body* of Christ.'

And again in the nineteenth verse he warns the Colossians against 'not holding fast the *Head*, from whom all the *body*, being supplied and knit together through the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God.' And lastly, in summing up the privileges of the Christian believer, and speaking of the duties arising from his union with Christ, and of the new human nature, of which, by virtue of this union, he has become a partaker, and through which he has become a member of Christ's body, he repeats in substance, and almost in form, what he said before to the Galatians and Ephesians, that in that body there cannot be Jew and Greek, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman and freeman: 'but Christ is all, and in all' (chap. iii. 11).

And here we may notice, before proceeding further, as additional evidence that this is the only meaning of the phrase 'the body of Christ' in St. Paul's own mind, that, when he speaks of the natural body of the Lord before His death, or of His glorified body after His resurrection, he speaks of the one with the needed qualification, 'the body of His flesh'

(Col. i. 22), and of the other as 'the body of His glory' (Phil. iii. 21).

We have now fully exhibited the meaning which St. Paul attaches to his own phrase, 'body of Christ,' and which we have seen to be always and emphatically 'the Church'—that union of men and women which more or less is animated by the Spirit of Christ; which He uses as His earthly instrument, and through which He works for the accomplishment of His own Divine purpose: the formation and establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth—a kingdom which is to be the embodiment of the Divine nature in humanity; and in which the will of God shall be done as it is done in heaven.

And this being St. Paul's own definition and meaning, we can have no safer or better guide to interpret all other passages in the Apostle's writings where the phrase occurs. And we will proceed now to apply this meaning to explain 1 Cor. x. 16: 'The bread which we break, is it not a "koinonia" of the body of the Christ?'

To remove, in order, the obstructions which lie in our way, we will exchange the phrase, 'the body of the Christ,' for St. Paul's own definition of it—'the Church'; and the question will then read: 'The bread which we break, is it not a "koinonia" of the Church?'

It is obvious that the Apostle's question presents three ideas to the mind of the reader:

1. The bread which was broken—the breaking of which bread was
2. A 'koinonia' of

3. The body of Christ, or the Church.

We have already shown that according to St. Paul's own definition, 'the body of the Christ' is the Church; and on this point we have no occasion to add anything more.

The next word requiring our attention is *κοινωνία*—'koinonia.' This word, as is well known, is an abstract noun, from 'koinos,' which means 'common to a number,' 'possessed or enjoyed, sharing, or shared in common,' and always signifies or implies that which is common to a number—union or bond of union of a number, for a common purpose or object in view. It never signifies division or separation, or an individual, as distinguished from a general or common participation of anything. It never signifies the participation of division, but only the participation of union.

Such unions may have many efficient causes or sources of origin, many ulterior purposes or objects of pursuit.

An analysis of the general idea involved in, or expressed by, the word, will show its legitimate uses and applications (see Appendix A). Primarily, it expresses the idea of a community, partnership, or brotherhood, acting in unity or concert. Secondly, the object or purpose, or proximate cause of their union. Thirdly, the formal instrument, sign, symbol, or custom which the society has established or recognises for the purpose.

Or we might say that every 'koinonia,' or company, which is always an organic unity of some kind—a united aggregate of parts with a common

centre or principle of action—has two essential factors, one spiritual or dynamic, the other formal. The first is the creating power, the attracting motion which draws together—that which unites—the essential bond of union. The second is the body so drawn together, the body composed of so many members and so united; the evolution of the dynamic factor into visible form and substance, and through which it becomes an outward body, the *κοινωνία* in its fulness and entirety being the union of both of these factors in operation.

Thus to illustrate. The British nation is a 'koinonia.' The pivotal centre, or bond of union, is the Queen, round which radiate the two Houses of Parliament. The Queen expresses her will through her Ministers. When the Parliament, representing the different orders of the people, join her in approval, the will so expressed becomes law to all the millions of her subjects—the 'koinonia'—to whom the measure applies.

The spiritual, or dynamic, bond of union of the State is loyalty to its constituted authorities, shown by willing obedience to the laws which are its expressed will. Its formal bond of union is either a birthright, in the case of a native, or, in the case of a foreigner who wishes to become a subject of the Queen, letters of naturalization.

The nation has two principal symbols :

1. The flag for the common use of all its subjects.
2. The great seal, which is used to legalize the administrative functions of its chief officers.

Again. An incorporated city is a 'koinonia.' Its

pivotal centre is the City Council, appointed or elected to administer its affairs. Its formal bond is the Charter of Incorporation, which confers upon it the right of managing its own affairs. The outward sign of membership or citizenship is the name of the participant officially entered on the roll of citizens, or in the annual list of members which is published by its authority.

To take another familiar instance. Teetotalism forms the subject of a large and popular 'koinonia.' The members of this body are united for the purpose of establishing a universal custom of fulfilling all the duties of social life without the present customary use of intoxicating drinks as a common beverage. The formal instrument, sign, or symbol of membership is the pledge, signed or spoken by the novitiate. The 'koinonia' in its fulness is seen in an assembly of pledged members joining together by speech and action to spread the principles which bind them together. But the spirit of the union is embodied in each of its members. By-and-by a more enthusiastic body sprang up amongst the teetotalers known as the 'Blue Ribbon Army.' This later form of aggressive teetotalism has the same pledge for its basis, but took as its more conspicuous symbol a piece of blue ribbon, worn openly in some part of the member's dress, thus making a public declaration, in season and out of season, of their common faith, object, and purpose, and thus making the ribbon so worn the special sign, outward bond, or symbol, of *their* union.

Every limited-liability company is a 'koinonia.'

In each case the bond of union is the money subscribed by each member on entering the company, which goes to form a common fund for the purpose of carrying on their business or trade. The formal instrument, symbol, or sign of membership is the share certificate.

Every self-contained community is a 'koinonia.' The newly-married couple, by virtue of their marriage, become a 'koinonia.' The family, the city, the tribe, the nation, are each of them a 'koinonia'—a union of men, or of men and women, for a common object.

Freemasonry is a 'koinonia.' It is a society holding within itself, and handing down from generation to generation, as its bond of union, ancient rites or symbols, containing, when rightly understood, a revelation of God as the Architect of the universe, the unity of the human race, and the consequent brotherhood of man. These knowledges, duly cultivated, help the growth of the spiritual nature of the Masonic brother and the general happiness of mankind. Freemasonry has numerous symbols, but its primary symbol is an occult sign of brotherhood, by which the Freemason is universally known and recognised by his brethren.

So the Church which has for its dynamic factor the Lord Jesus Christ is a 'koinonia.' Its objective purpose is to spread abroad over the earth the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of the human race, and to unite all men in the bond of this common faith. Its Divine bond of union is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ at once inspiring and animating and making anew its members, who

collectively form the body of Christ, in His Divine image and likeness. The outward symbol or sign of membership in, or belonging to, the body of Christ—ordained by the Lord Himself—is sitting at a common table and ‘breaking bread’—partaking of food—together, as brethren, in remembrance of Him, *i.e.*, for the purpose of calling Him to mind; for the purpose of growing into His likeness, and reflecting His image in human life, which at once ensures His Divine presence in the soul of the disciple, and at the same time recalls the believer into the memory of the Saviour.

Now, in the light of these illustrations, let us read St. Paul’s question: ‘The bread which we break, is it not a bond of the union of the Church?’ To sit at the table of the Lord is the outward sign of Christian brotherhood and union. This ‘breaking of bread together’ is the symbol of Church membership—the outward sign of belonging to Christ, of being a member of Christ’s body; and individual participation in this ‘breaking of bread’ is the Churches’ recognition of the fact, which personally makes each individual one with the Saviour, and, so far, a member of His body, an external manifestation of Him who is his Life and his Salvation.

We have now cleared the ground for the full explanation of the second clause of the Apostle’s question, and so we will read: ‘The bread which we break, is it not the symbol of our Christian fellowship and brotherhood, of our being members of the Church, and so of our belonging to Christ, and of our oneness with Christ our Head?’

The first clause of the question still remains for consideration. The phrase 'to break bread' means to exercise the rites of hospitality. It is an Eastern expression that describes in a figure the functions of the head of a family presiding at his family table, and distributing to the guests their respective portions of the good things provided for them, and their joint participation of them.* And the family table as a common bond unites the company, for the time being, in a 'koinonia.'

This 'breaking of bread' requires as its necessary constituents three several elements: 1. A common table round which the company gather; 2. The orderly arrangement of the food to be eaten; 3. The joint participation of the food provided. And thus the phrase 'to break bread' signifies to hold a festive party, or a social gathering of friends, just as the more modern phrase 'to take tea' implies or involves all the adjuncts named. And thus the meaning of the phrase 'to break bread' is not to be limited to its apparent literal signification of dividing a loaf into pieces, but must be understood in its wider sense as including all the particulars mentioned. And the emphasis, if any, in St. Paul's question should be laid upon the word 'we'—the bread which 'we' break; and this has its exact equivalent in the corresponding phrase, 'our breaking of bread,' and this is what the

* The Church of Rome acknowledges this in her administration of the wafer to her communicants. There is no 'breaking of bread' in the literal sense of the words in the Romish rite. The priest presides at the altar, and 'breaks the bread' of the Lord's table by giving with his own hands to each communicant his share of the food provided.

Apostle means by this clause of his question : 'Is not our breaking of bread at the Lord's table a symbol ordained by Christ Himself to express and embody the brotherhood of the Church and its unity with Himself?' a unity which constitutes every individual Christian a member of the body of Christ, every local Church an organized embodiment of Christ, and the Church universal 'the fulness of God in Him' (Ephes. i. 23).

And that this is the meaning of the Apostle may be seen from the verse following (1 Cor. x. 17): 'Even as it is one bread, we, the many (who are in Christ), are one body, for we are all joint partakers of the one bread.' And then he puts this Christian 'breaking of bread,' this social union of Christians, considered as the expression of the believer's unity in and with Christ, into contrast with, and in direct opposition to, social unions of Jews and of heathen Gentiles in their respective sacrificial feasts. 'Look at Israel after the flesh; are not the eaters of their sacrifices,' *κοινωνοι*, 'koinonoi,' 'associates of,' 'united in spirit with' the altars at which their sacrifices have been offered? (ver. 18). And so we may thus paraphrase his following words (vers. 19-21). And 'whilst not teaching that an idol is anything to a disciple of Christ, more than the materials of which it is made; or that that which is offered to an idol is anything more than, or different from ordinary food, so long as it is not eaten with a conscious reference to the idol—I do say that these heathen services carry the worshipper into a spiritual communion or common partnership with demons, whose power and influence upon earth the

Lord Jesus came to destroy, and I would not have you enter into any such union with demons.'

Remember | 'Remember that all conscious participation in idol services conjoins the worshippers spiritually to the demon which the idol represents—in like manner as your partaking of the Lord's Supper conjoins you to the Lord—and you cannot partake of the Lord's table and the table of demons.' You cannot be a willing servant of the demons, who are the enemies of God, and yet be a disciple of Christ. You may choose for yourselves the object and form of your worship and service, but your choice and your practice inseparably unite you with the spiritual power and influence to which you ally yourselves. You may indeed choose which God you will serve, the true or the false; but you cannot serve both.

The preceding verse: 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the "koinonia" of the blood of Christ?' we shall consider after we have shown St. Paul's meaning of 1 Cor. xi. 17-34.

CHAPTER II.

Application of Paul's definition to 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24.—Meaning of the word 'body.'—'This do in remembrance of Me.'

ONE other passage remains for consideration—1 Cor. xi. 23, 24: 'I received from the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it,* and said, This is My body, which is for you. This do in remembrance of Me;' or, 'This do for the perpetual renewal of My memory.'

In this passage the Apostle not only gives us the form of the Lord's Supper, as the Lord Himself ordained it; but he includes in the narrative, as a constituent part of it, the historical facts connected

* Note here that the bread was broken, *i.e.*, it had been distributed amongst the assembled company when our Lord spake the words, 'This is My body, which is for you. This do in remembrance of Me,' *i.e.*, 'celebrate the supper for the perpetual renewal of My memory in the earth.' In the first Gospel the narrator describes the Institution from the common sacramental standpoint. But inasmuch as the Lord instituted no priesthood to stand in His place, we have in this fact demonstrative proof of the much later origin of that narrative, and so that the compiler wrote, not from a historical standpoint, but to give an apparent Divine sanction to the custom and doctrine of that branch of the Church to which he belonged.

with the institution, all of which he declares 'he received from the Lord.'

We therefore conclude that the narrative includes not only all that the Apostle deemed needful for the correction and instruction of the Corinthian Church at the time he wrote; but, by direct inference, all that the Divine wisdom saw needful for the Apostle's instruction and guidance in the fulfilment of his apostolic commission and duties. And so in the last resort it becomes the standard by which the accuracy of every other account must be measured, and to which they must be submitted for correction, if there be any difference between them.

Before we proceed further to apply St. Paul's meaning of the phrase 'the body of Christ,' to the interpretation of our Lord's own words, we may premise that *μου τὸ σῶμα*, 'the body of Me,' from the mouth of the Lord, on this occasion has its exact equivalent in the corresponding phrase *τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 'the body of the Christ,' from the pen of St. Paul.

We have already shown, beyond the possibility of rational contradiction or doubt, what St. Paul understood by the words 'body of Christ' (see Appendix B). The only 'body of Christ' of which the Apostle teaches anything was the Church of Christ, either local or universal. Strictly speaking, a local Church can only practically exist in its own assembly. The formal purpose of its assembly was to break the bread of brotherhood together at the Lord's table for the renewal or revival of the memory of the Lord Christ. At the orderly assembly of the Church at

Corinth there was a real supper provided for this purpose. The materials of this supper were sufficient to satisfy the wants of hungry men, and to enable others to drink to excess. These are all plain matters of fact involved in the Apostle's description of it. There was no priest present to administer the elements. So far as appears, the Corinthian supper in its arrangements was a transcript of the Last Supper of the Lord with His disciples. It is in perfect harmony with the account given in chapter xiii. of the fourth Gospel so far as that account extends. In the midst of the Corinthian supper it was the duty of each member of the Church 'to break bread' with his neighbours at the table, in obedience to the injunction of the Lord addressed to all who were present, 'This do for the renewal of My memory amongst yourselves.' And this breaking of bread together on the part of each one sitting at the table was regarded as a token of, and the evidence of, their fraternal equality, and of their union with each other as disciples of Christ and members of His body.

It will be observed that in all this statement of the Apostle, from the beginning to the end of it, there is not the remotest reference to the modern doctrine of the Church, that the disciples were eating the body of Christ, or drinking the blood of Christ. It is the Lord's supper, the Lord's bread, the Lord's cup. It is elsewhere, 1 Cor. x. 21, 'The Lord's table.' The bread is the bread of the Lord, not the body of Christ. The cup is the cup of the Lord, not the blood of Christ. It is the Lord's table around which

all sit. There is no allusion to an altar and the offering up of a victim, nor of the Passover in any way. It is curious too, that the word 'Christ' is not found in the narrative. Throughout it is 'the Lord' the risen Saviour, who is alone presented to our imagination by the Apostle.

Now let the reader ask himself the question, If the Apostle Paul had held the doctrine of transubstantiation as taught in the Greek, Latin, and Anglican Churches, is it possible that he could have written such a passage of definite instructions on the subject as this in 1 Cor. xi. 17-34, and omit all reference to the mystery? There can be but one answer, and that answer must be emphatically 'No;' the thing is impossible.

When our Lord instituted the Supper as His abiding and perpetual memorial, the word 'church,' in its ordinary New Testament meaning, was not known. Neither as a fact in the world's history, nor as an idea in the disciples' minds, had it any existence. It was therefore impossible for our Lord to have used it. The words He did speak we have reported to us in St. Paul's narrative (see Appendix C). Let us endeavour to ascertain, if we can, what our Lord meant by His use of the word 'soma,' 'body,' on this occasion, and what the specific idea was which He intended to convey by it.

St. Paul, certainly—there can be no rational doubt on the subject—understood by the phrase 'body of Christ' the Church. So far we are standing on solid ground. And, further, by the word 'Church' he understood a community of believers spiritually

united by their common faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour ; by their cordial acceptance of Him as their spiritual Head and Exemplar ; by their loving obedience to Him as their Divine Teacher and Guide ; and objectively or outwardly by their 'breaking bread together in obedience to His command.'

And interpreting the spoken words according to the ordinary and universal law of the Greek language in relation to the necessary agreement in gender of nouns and pronouns, this is the only possible meaning of the words spoken. The pronoun τοῦτό, 'this,' is neuter ; the word ἄρτος, 'bread,' is masculine. The words cannot be construed together without a breach of the rules of Greek syntax.* There is between them an impassable gulf.

And there is not the least necessity for any such forced grammatical construction. The Apostle himself describes the institution under the general title 'deipnon'—'supper,' ver. 20. And in this connection the word 'deipnon' is the exact equivalent of the phrase 'breaking of bread.'

We will, therefore, paraphrase the words of our Lord in harmony with St. Paul's doctrine. 'This (social union) this (supper)† is for you, the clothing

* The word ἄρτος occurs some 99 times in the New Testament. In no less than 50 of these it is construed with masculine adjuncts. In no case is it found conjoined with a word in the neuter gender.

† Let it be remembered here that the Apostle teaches, as we have already seen, that the 'breaking of bread,' which he designates 'the Lord's Supper' in the twentieth verse, is the 'koinonia' spoken of in chap. x. 16, as the outward bond of the union of the Church. Each of the two words, 'deipnon,'

and symbol of My spirit ;—My time manifestation. Let all who shall hereafter believe in Me—let all who are animated by My spirit, keep—observe—celebrate this supper, for the renewal of My memory—for the purpose of calling Me to mind, until I come again. This supper is for you, and for all My disciples, the symbol of your brotherhood in Me ; and as each one of you makes discipleship to Me the rule and purpose of his life, I will be with him, spiritually uniting Myself to him as a consciously Divine force, delivering him from his fleshly and self-centred life, which is the beginning and power of sin in him, and lifting him up to a higher plane of existence, in which he shall be conscious of My presence with, and in him, and of his own sonship to the Universal Father, so that he shall become a representative of Me in the world, reflecting the image of My Sonship in himself.'

To read 'bread'—'This bread is My Church'—is impossible. The Apostle's word, 'deipnon'—'supper'—found in the twentieth verse, meets all the difficulty. There is no grammatical, nor, indeed, any real difficulty, logically or doctrinally, connected with this view of the subject. The difficulties all lie on the other side.

And at this supper—this breaking of bread—at

'supper,' and 'koinonia,' 'bond or symbol of union,' refers to the same fact, and represents the same idea, because 'the supper' was the 'symbol of union' of every local Church.

Like 'koinonia,' the supper has three elements: (1) The people sitting at the table ; (2) the food upon the table ; (3) joint-participation of the food provided. And this, in its entirety, is the symbol of the Church, or 'the body of Christ.'

our Lord's institution of the service, as we have already seen—there were the Twelve reclining at table with Him ; and so that supper, which was the last act of our Lord's life in concert with His disciples, became the solemn inauguration of these disciples, as His representative body on earth—the body known afterwards as the Church ; as the earthly medium for the deploy of His Spirit ; as His human instrument for carrying on and carrying out the work which He Himself came to accomplish—the gradual formation of His earthly kingdom, until, in the plenitude of His Divine power, He should come again to make an end of sin and bring in everlasting righteousness.

And what diviner idea can we connect with the institution of the Supper than that which we find set forth in the apostolic narrative ? Compare with it the sacramental theories of the Greek, the Latin, and the Lutheran Churches. Can any rational being remain a moment in doubt as to the question which of these doctrines is most worthy of human acceptance ? or which represents, in the highest degree, the Divine wisdom and goodness, in thus sending the message of the Gospel to the world, and embodying that message in mankind ?

The religion taught by our Lord is pre-eminently human, and adapted to the rational and social nature of man—ever appealing to, ever meeting and answering human wants, and harmonizing with those intellectual and affectional elements in man which are the avenues to his Divine spiritual life.

Whilst our Lord lived on earth He Himself could

from His Divine wisdom naturally, as well as spiritually, lead and guide His disciples. And now that by His ascension to a higher sphere and plane of existence He could no longer be with those disciples outwardly, whose union with Himself was still as needful as ever for the accomplishment of His Divine mission to mankind, He forms them, through the two elements of brotherly love and faith in Himself, into an organized human brotherhood, spiritually united to, and evermore growing into a more perfect unity with Himself, and calls them His own body ; thus making them the flesh and blood medium, for the transmission of His Spirit to those whom they taught, and who accepted their teachings in truth and love ; and He gives the united brotherhood a material base in a common family table.

And this was for their own individual profit and growth in grace. The Supper afforded to each one the opportunity of increasing personal knowledge of the rest, and thus of mutual service to each other—the fruit, the only fruit possible, of their uniting love, in which and through which the Lord could spiritually manifest Himself, and so connect Himself with His earthly body for the salvation of the world.

For though ascended into the heavens—nay, rather, because of His glorification—He still stands in need of a ‘soma’—an earthly medium—as the connecting link, the conduit pipe, the conductor of the Divine force in Him, to the human vessels He came to save ; to evolve His Divine spirit in the souls of men ; to create them anew in His image ; as much so as when He—the Word become flesh—stood on

the plains of Galilee, teaching and preparing His disciples for the work which they could thus be fitted to accomplish.

Consider the time, the occasion, the people ; and it will be seen that no diviner form of outward union at once so perfect, so simple, and enduring, as that which the Lord Jesus initiated in that solemn night in which He was betrayed, could the highest and profoundest human genius have suggested, than that of the disciples breaking bread together ; and at the same time making the institution of the Last Supper His abiding and perpetual memorial.

Let us pause here to consider more particularly the meaning of the word 'body.' Body is at once the outcome of life and the organ of its manifestation on the plane of nature. It is the natural continent of force. Body is the natural clothing and the exponent of spirit, which it thus manifests, and so becomes its universal symbol. A body is a natural organic form through which spirit and faculty deploy and work. No spiritual power can work harmoniously in nature without natural clothing and embodiment—without a natural instrument or medium through which its force or strength is put forth ; and that instrument is, for the time being, its body, which is the ultimate and continent of the spiritual force which called it into existence (see Appendix B). We cannot conceive of God working without such an instrument. His Divine instrument for the salvation of the world is the body of the Lord Jesus Christ. So long as the Lord Jesus stood upon the plane of nature, His flesh and blood, organized in His natural body, was the one

human instrument through which, primarily, the power and love and Spirit of God flowed forth to this end. But death removed His natural body from this earthly sphere. The purpose of His human life—the conversion of the world to Himself—was then unfinished, and the same kind of instrumentality through a human organization was still necessary to carry on the work to a successful issue. He had whilst here established between His disciples and Himself peculiar relations of body as well as of soul. He took upon Himself and entered into their natural conditions, as they into His spiritual, and these relations were made visible in the exercise of their miraculous powers, and subsequently by the descent of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. In measure they were to be as He Himself was. These relations were needful for the prosecution of His future work ; for He came to spiritually animate and inform the bodies as well as the souls of men. It is a delusion to suppose that God can be served and worshipped by the spiritual imagination only. The body is to be the subject of the Divine law, and included in the service and worship. And the natural body, being primarily the bonds slave of sin, and thus holding within itself elements of repulsion to the work of the Saviour, requires a divinely regenerative influence to bring its motions into harmony with the Divine will.

The one element in human nature into which the risen Saviour can inflow by His Divine spiritual power and life, and work through, for the Divine evolution of the race He came to save, to elevate into a permanent consciousness of union with God, is brotherly

love. The universal human custom which represents this brotherly love in its broadest natural manifestation is 'breaking bread together'—sitting at the same family table and taking food in common. Everywhere this exercise of hospitality was and is a sacred custom and institution. It involves the recognition of a common brotherhood and of social equality, and is evidence of the existence of mutual regard, friendship, and sympathy ; and on and through the full recognition of these natural qualities alone can social union, whether natural or Divine, be built up.

To some extent the Jews recognised this truth. The celebration of the Passover required every Jew, to whatever rank of life he belonged, to join in it, on terms of brotherhood and equality. At this season rich and poor, high and low, master and servant, broke bread together. Our Lord laid hold of this national custom, enlarging its sphere of operation. It was henceforth to bind humanity in a common bond, in which there should be neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, but He Himself should be all in all.

Again, in its last analysis, and on the plane of pure intellectual thought, as we have already said, 'body' is the universal symbol of spirit.

A man animated by the faith and spirit of Christ, seeking to unite himself, in and through brotherly love, with others, for the purpose of doing them good, and offering himself, as the occasion demands, a willing sacrifice for their spiritual growth and welfare, is a symbol of Christ ; and when we have a union of

such men, each and all animated by this Divine principle, and seeking as the end and purpose of their lives the welfare and happiness of each other, and of all whom they can bring within the sphere of their influence, we have the most perfect natural manifestation of Christ that can exist on earth.*

And that this is St. Paul's doctrine of the Lord's Supper he offers abundant evidence. In his Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. iv. 4-12, he teaches expressly that 'there is one body, and one Spirit . . . one Lord . . . one God and Father of all. . . . To each one of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of the Christ. . . . He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of service, unto the building up of the body of the Christ.'

And now compare this with what he writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 4-27): 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; there are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord; there are diversities of workings, but the same God. For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit: to another faith, in the same Spirit; and to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit; and to another workings of miracles; and to another prophecy; and to another discernings of spirits: to another divers kinds of tongues: but all these worketh one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally

* We shall refer to this again when we come to speak of the symbolism of the Cup.

even as he wills. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is the Christ. For by one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. . . . God hath set the members each one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him. . . . There are many members, but one body . . . that the members should have the same care one of another. And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is glorified, all the members rejoice with it.' And the Apostle thus sums up the whole: 'Now ye'—in your organized union as a church—'are "σῶμα"'—not 'το σῶμα,' for that phrase is significant of the Church universal; but 'soma,' a body, or, better, 'an embodiment, an external manifestation of Christ'—an organization for Christ to work through and inspire and control—to make use of as His own body, 'and severally members thereof.'

But the actual words spoken by our Lord are peculiar, and scarcely admit of a literal, and at the same time of a full and adequate translation:

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

We think that the meaning of these words is imperfectly represented by the common formula, 'This do in remembrance of Me;' but not to distract our reader's attention from the more important question as to the true meaning of the phrase, 'body of Christ,'

we will leave the further consideration of this to another opportunity.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the words, 'eis ten emen anamnesin,' grammatically and logically imply that '*I* may call *you* again to mind,' as well as that '*you* may call *Me* again to mind.' The relation of the Church to the Lord is quite as needful as the relation of the Lord to the Church for the work He had, and has yet, to accomplish.

The Church is the Divine instrument without which the Master cannot work. Without His body on the plains of Galilee the Lord Jesus—the Word become flesh—could not have instructed His disciples, or led men to Himself. The Church as His present body on earth is similarly required. His Divine command, 'Love one another, as I have loved you,' involves the one condition of all true and effectual service. His Spirit cannot enter into the heart where love is absent. And love is service. The Divine fire of the Spirit enters into the love, and passes with it through service from heart to heart. It is only through such love that we can become His disciples, and so become His helpful servants to lift up men to Himself. Without such love in His disciples' hearts, He is Himself powerless to effect that radical change in individual human nature and society, that is to transform this world, and those who dwell upon it, into the kingdom of God. And on the part of the disciples, considered as members of the Lord's body, the Lord's Supper is the first and least social expression—the burgeoning expression—of that love.

It is from this Supper as a platform that the Gospel

of God's love to man is to be universally exhibited to the human race. No man must draw a dividing line between himself and his brother, or come between his brother and God, because the love of God extends to all and embraces all, and the Spirit of Christ unites all in one body. It is only as all personal and social walls of division and separation are broken down by the force of fraternal love that the kingdom of God can come, and His will be done on earth as it is done in heaven.

We may see the same idea of the absolute necessity of personal unity with Christ—of becoming members of His body—in order to become the subjects of His salvation, and one with Him in His Divine work, running through the discourse that followed. Take, for instance, the Parable of the Vine. We have in it the exact idea of the union of the members of Christ in His body, but expressed in even simpler language: 'I am the true Vine, and My Father is the Husbandman. Every branch in Me not bearing fruit He taketh away, and every branch bearing fruit He cleanseth it that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in Me, and I will abide in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, so ye cannot bear fruit except ye remain in Me. I am the Vine, ye are the branches . . . apart from Me ye can do nothing. If ye abide in me, and My words abide in you, ask what ye will and it shall be done to you.' 'Even as the Father loveth Me, so I also have loved you. Abide in My love. If ye keep My commandments, ye shall abide' (live, breathe,

and work) 'in My love, as I have kept My Father's commandments, and abide' (live, breathe, and work) 'in His love' (John xv. 1-10).

We can do nothing without the indwelling, inspiring, and informing Christ ; and we can only become vehicles for the Divine Spirit as we give ourselves out in loving service to our fellow-men. The man who seeks to save his own soul without labouring for the good of others as the Divine medium for its attainment is wasting his energies in mere Sisyphean labours that can end in nothing but disappointment and loss. Christ can only work in a man as the man himself permits the Lord to work through him for the good of others. The sap of the Divine life must flow through each branch and twig of the tree to bring forth fruit ; otherwise the branch is useless, becomes withered, and dies. This is the great lesson that we all have to learn before we can be admitted into the joy of our Lord.

But our Lord teaches the same truth directly as well as parabolically. 'Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on Me through their word ; that they all may be one ; even as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us . . . and the glory that Thou hast given Me I have given unto them, that they *may be one, even as we are one* ; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one ; that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them, even as Thou lovedst Me' (John xvii. 20-23).

The purpose of God in Christ is here taught to be the unification of the human race in the Divine love,

and in the Divine nature. As the writer of the Second Epistle of Peter says : ' He hath granted unto us His precious and exceeding great promises, that through these ye may become partakers of the Divine nature ' (chap. i. 4). We are to become incarnations of God by becoming members of the body of Christ by spiritual and personal union with Him.

The first step towards the attainment of this end is a true faith in, and a practical acknowledgment of, the brotherhood of man. This, so far as the lesson can be taught by an outward institution, is provided for in the Lord's Supper, by the disciples being required fraternally to break bread together at the same table, and so, in this first step of the Christian life, the Lord's command is definite and unqualified. ' This do : take food together at the same table, over which united solemn prayer and thanksgiving to God, for His common mercies vouchsafed to all, shall be offered by all who assemble together in acknowledgment of their common brotherhood in Me. And this brotherly union of My disciples shall be My perpetual memorial.'

But there is a profounder meaning of the words used on this occasion, and thus a profounder illustration of the symbolic meaning of the Lord's Supper than any we have yet shown, and this profounder meaning and illustration is, in truth, the keynote to the entire harmony of the Lord's Supper and of the Christian life.

The word *λαμβάνω*—'lambano' (to take), usually, if not always, implies appropriation, personal possession, property. It implies for the time being absolute

control over the thing taken. Our Lord, by taking the bread or food eaten at the Supper, assumed proprietary possession, a personal right over it. It was His own to do what He chose with. But He no sooner takes personal possession of the bread than He shows the purpose of His doing so. First, He gives thanks to His Heavenly Father for the mercy so vouchsafed to Him, and then forthwith breaks it—distributes it amongst His disciples ; thus showing that He only held the bread for the use to which He was putting it, *i.e.*, for the establishment and illustration of the Divine brotherhood He was then forming, and to make use of it for the good of all who then partake of it, or who, by virtue of the Divine Institution, should hereafter partake of it, to help them to become one body in and with Himself, and thus held for the good of Himself only as that good came through them to Him. And this is in truth the most Godlike meaning of our Lord's words, 'This is My body for you.' This is an embodiment of My Spirit in you. This voluntary surrender of your own property to bless your brethren, by calling Me to mind, by the inflowing of the love of God into your hearts, constitutes you My body. 'This is My body for you.'

The bread or food which our Lord thus possessed Himself of, and which He divided amongst His disciples, signifies and includes all personal possessions with which we can meet and supply the wants of our brother Christians, who are with us members of the body of Christ. To claim anything as our own as against the wants of our brothers and sisters—members of the one body of Christ—involves rebellion

against God and separation from the Divine unity that makes us one with Christ. The Church, which is the body of Christ, the true Church of God, is made up of that portion of humanity, and that portion only, who aim to conform their lives to the life and example of the Saviour, who aim to live by those rules of life which He taught and illustrated by this act of His Divine human life. We thus learn that everything which we call our own, and which human law and custom gives up to our possession and allows us to appropriate is, by the law of Christ, only ours in the sense that we are personally able to consecrate it to human service in the way that seems best to us, and if we neglect to do this, by so much and so far we are wanting in the fulfilment of the one supreme duty of self-consecration to Christ.

Such use and distribution of goods constitutes the professed disciple a member of Christ's body. Every Christian is to 'break bread' with his neighbour. This 'breaking of bread' is only an illustration of a universal duty, which includes in its scope all possessions, whether affectional, intellectual or material. All—everything we call our own—is by the ordination of God, and thus taught through and by our Divine Saviour, to be consecrated to the service of man. And in this way we are to show, and prove to others, and realize the fact to ourselves, that we are all members of one family; that humanity, as a whole, is one universal brotherhood, with God for its common Father, and Jesus for its Lord and King.

The cup includes a voluntary participation of the sufferings of others, to assuage them, and lessen their

force. In 'breaking bread' we impart of our acquired possessions to those who need them. In 'drinking the cup' we voluntarily offer ourselves to the Lord, to enter into the sorrows of our fellow Christians, that by such participation we may lighten their load, and by such sympathy increase the strength of the sufferer to bear them, and so, on our own part, to fulfil the law of Christ.

CHAPTER III.

A critical examination of 1 Cor. xi. 17-34.

A CRITICAL examination of the entire passage, 1 Cor. xi. 17-34, will, we think, confirm our general conclusions.

We will first bring into juxtaposition the several verses directly referring to the subject.

Verse 17: 'I cannot praise you, that ye come together not for blessing, but for judgment.

Verse 18: 'For I hear that, when ye come together in Church assembly, your factious divisions . . .

Verse 20: 'Render it impossible for you to eat the Lord's Supper,

Verse 21: 'And that every one of you turns the occasion into an opportunity of eating his own supper without regard to the rest; and one eats with a gross appetite, and another drinks to excess.

Verse 22: 'What! Have ye not homes at which ye can eat and drink? Or is it that ye despise assemblies of the people of God, and put out of countenance those who have not? What shall I say to you? Praise you? Not for this.

Verse 23: 'For that which I taught you, and left with you to observe and keep, I received from the

Lord, how that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and on giving thanks, brake it and said, This is My body, which is for you ; this do in remembrance of Me.'

It will be seen that the Apostle makes two charges against the Corinthians: (1) That their factious divisions made it impossible for them to eat the Lord's Supper, which was their common bond of union, though this was the real object of their assembling together ; and this because the Supper was essentially a spiritual feast of brotherhood, concord, and unity. And (2) that under the influence of these same factious feelings, the sacred institution had been desecrated amongst them, into acts of mere selfish sensual eating and drinking, whereby some ate to excess, and others drank to excess, alike disgraceful both to the doers and to the Church which permitted it.

The Apostle proceeds to censure this conduct, but for remedy of the evil only restates his former instructions, viz., that the Lord's Supper was to be observed for the purpose of uniting them in one brotherhood, and of calling the Lord to mind, by the mutual exhibition of His Spirit in mutual love and Divine reverence, and that the true form of it was that which he had before taught them : for each one of them to sit at a common table, to take bread, to give thanks, and break it amongst themselves. And that this breaking of bread together in brotherly love according to the Lord's example constituted them the body of Christ (see Appendix B), according to His gracious promise and purpose.

Does it not seem certain, then, from the form and force of our Lord's injunction, and of St. Paul's application of it, that it was the duty of each member of the Corinthian Church to break bread with his neighbour at the Church table, which was the Lord's table ; and to extend to each other, as opportunity offered, this acknowledgment of common brotherhood in Christ, after the example of the Lord, and in the way enjoined by Him ?

Let it be remembered here, that there was no priest present to 'administer the elements' to those seated around the table ; St. Paul had no priests in the Churches he formed. Each member of the Corinthian Church should have sat down at the 'Lord's table' to take supper with the rest, and ought, according to the Apostle's instructions, to have followed the example of the Lord, 'who, in the night in which He was betrayed, took bread, gave thanks, and brake it' to the company around Him at the table. This giving and receiving, and eating of the bread so distributed, in company with each other, constituted the outward bond of their Christian union. And it is clear that if each one present had done so—had thus 'broken bread' according to the Divine example and command—no one would have been guilty of perverting the Lord's Supper into an act of private eating and drinking—of turning the solemn occasion into an opportunity of gluttony and excess. We have before us in these words of the Apostle the double offence and the apostolic correction.

We have no precise knowledge, as to its special

details, how the supper was provided or arranged in the Corinthian Church ; but we are obliged to suppose very different conditions of celebration from those which prevail now. And these new conditions involve changes for which there is no Scriptural or adequate authority. The Supper, it is clear, was, according to the Apostle's instructions, a real one, with materials to satisfy both hunger and thirst. It was not a 'wafer' or a corresponding 'piece of best wheaten bread.' A priest to administer the elements would have had no place there. And that this form continued in use in many local Churches is shown by 'The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,'* in which the communicants are instructed to give thanks—*μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι*—'after being filled,' chap. x., § 1.

But the Apostle's reproofs, corrections, and instructions are chiefly valuable and important to us, because they so far give a clear utterance of his understanding of the Lord's injunction, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' It is quite certain that our Lord's command to 'break bread in remembrance of Him' was addressed to each one of the Twelve, and through them to every disciple in all ages. And so the Apostle taught that all the members of the Corinthian Church were 'to break bread' with each other, which could only mean that they were to share a common meal on terms of brotherly equality with the other members of the

* This work, composed probably late in the first, or early in the second century, knows nothing of 'priests.' There were apostles and prophets, teachers and deacons, but the priest is nowhere named.

Church—each one giving to, and in return receiving from, another—in remembrance of the Lord, to show forth His spirit and life.

The Lord's Supper, as St. Paul's words imply, was a social fraternal gathering of all the brethren of the Corinthian Church; was a social union of them as members of the body of Christ; was *de facto* the Church itself; that Divine human organization, in and by which the individual Christian character of each member was to be built up, and through which the Saviour was to work in the city and neighbourhood of Corinth for the establishment of His kingdom there.

In short, the Supper, considered as to its human factors, was the Lord's time-manifestation to spread abroad the glories of His name and power and love. Considered as to its Divine idea it was brotherhood and service.

The Supper was intended to be, and might have been, all this, but, unfortunately, the factions into which the Corinthian Church was divided rendered such a consummation impossible. Instead of one united people orderly assembling at a fixed time, their want of brotherly regard for each other led them to come to the Church assembly according to their factions, as and when they pleased. Each one 'laid hold of the opportunity' (ver. 21), most agreeable to himself, and sat down at the table with his own faction, or alone. The place of assembly for the time being bore the marks of a disorderly eating-house. The Supper of the Lord was not eaten. Each member of the Church might, indeed, eat a

supper, but it was his own supper, not the Lord's, and so open to all the excesses which followed.

It seems probable that each member who was able took with him a portion of the food required, and so far the food was his own; but it was not broken—it was not shared with—it was not distributed in love amongst the assembled Church. At the best it was only shared with persons in whom he had a special interest. And in this there was no Church unity, no unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. The Lord was not spiritually present in the hearts of His people.

As it was thus evident that the Corinthians had neglected, or forgotten his previous instructions, the Apostle repeated them; but clearly he judged this repetition in the Lord's name enough for the purpose he had in view—the correction of their errors and misdeeds.

The Apostle's teaching, however, certainly implies that, to eat the Lord's Supper, it is essential to obey the Lord's command. They were all to sit down together to a feast of good fellowship and fraternal love, and in this way to call their Lord to mind, by doing as He did—acknowledging their brotherhood by breaking bread with each other, and amongst themselves at a common table, which, for the time being, was the table of the Lord.

Such breaking of bread was an act of social union—a recognition of common brotherhood by all present, and a pledge of mutual service; and as such it was the expression and ultimatum of an inward spiritual life, which in its inmost was the Lord Him-

self—for Christ is the life of the Christian. This social union implied and involved, amongst themselves, spiritual fraternal union; and through their common faith in their common Lord, and their common baptism into His death (Rom. vi. 3), such fraternal union was purified and elevated into a holy spiritual union with the Saviour—into a Divine ‘*koinonia*’ of themselves and the Lord Christ.

From henceforth this “breaking of bread” represented the most sacred outward union of men and women upon earth. By obeying the Lord’s command His disciples became not merely followers *of* Him, but so far, *ONE* with Him—became members of His body, in which, and by which, and through which they were to become one Spirit, as well as one body with the Lord; and by whose labours in such conjunction the world was to be converted to and brought into fellowship with Himself; little by little, until His Divine Spirit should permeate the human race, and ‘God would be all in all.’

And that this is the true meaning of the phrase ‘breaking of bread’ is confirmed by the account given in the Acts of the Apostles of the manner of life of the first Christians in Jerusalem. It is said of them that they ‘continued steadfastly in the Apostles’ teachings and fellowship, in the “breaking of bread” and in prayers. . . . And all that believed were together and had all things common; and they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, according as any man had need. And day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and “breaking bread” at home, *they took their*

food together with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people' (Acts ii. 42, 44-46).

One other corroborative observation, and we pass on.

The command, 'This do in remembrance of Me'—to bring My Spirit into your midst—was addressed to all the assembled company at the institution of the Supper, without any limitation. The Twelve then represented the universal Church. The command is addressed to all, and includes every disciple of Christ to the end of time; or, as St. Paul says, 'until He come.' It is not possible, having regard to the common meaning of the words, that the reception of a wafer from the hands of a priest, or of a small piece of bread at the communion rails of the National Church, can be the breaking of bread enjoined by the Lord. The act in that form is void of that social communion and equality which are essential elements of the Lord's Supper, and, indeed, can scarcely be said to be a breaking of bread at all; for only by a very imperfect figure of speech can such an act be said to be performed even by the ministrant himself.

Obedience to the Lord's command requires an active agent in the work. The value and importance of the Supper are found in what it teaches and in the Divine truth which it expresses, and in the Holy Spirit it brings down into the hearts of the communicants; and not in the physical facts of eating and drinking. At the best the modern communicant is only a passive agent, witnessing the doing of his own

duty by another. There is no fulfilment of the Lord's injunction in his share of the service. He does not 'break bread' with the officiating priest. But the Church is an inviolable brotherhood. Every Christian is a king and priest in God's kingdom, the Church of God. And to shut out ninety-nine of every hundred of the Church universal—of all the people of God—from obeying the Lord's command, seems the strangest of all possible methods of rendering obedience, and showing reverence to the Lord who gave it, and who said : 'Ye are My friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.'

This history is pregnant with instruction. Observe (1) that love to the Lord is the only condition of belonging to the Lord's family ; and (2) that the only condition of becoming a member of the Lord's body is brotherhood with, and willing service to, the other members of the body of Christ. The first and least of such uses—the door of entry into the body—being a sympathetic acknowledgment of the brotherhood of all the Lord's people by a fraternal breaking of bread, and ripening into an acceptance of the New Covenant of God in Christ by drinking the Cup. The Lord lays down no doctrinal test for admission of membership into His body, the Church. The Twelve were united to Him by loving sympathy alone. Nor did He give any authority to the Twelve to impose any doctrinal tests or to exclude any who accept Him as their Saviour in sincerity and truth. And so it is clear that any man or body of men who claim and exercise such power to stand between the Lord and His people—to 'come before Him'—to interpose them-

selves between the Shepherd and His sheep—are by the Lord's own judgment 'thieves and robbers' (John x. 8). By such assumption the authority of the Lord as the Head of the Church is superseded, and the man guilty of it separates himself by his disloyalty from the true vine, and becomes a withered branch. There is no rule of admission into the flock of Christ other than believing in Him and desire of being like Him; nor any possibility of becoming a healthy member of the body of Christ, except by the practice of the law of love—the heart's recognition of universal brotherhood in the Church—which is the supreme rule of life to the Christian. He is to be led of the Spirit, and the motions of the Spirit of Christ in the heart of the disciple are ever to its own growth and to the renewal of the Divine image in the soul; to close and ever closer union with the Divine Saviour, and so to love and unity of the brethren; and to love and self-sacrifice for each other.

Into this love—this embodied element of Himself—the Lord continually inflows, as the Spiritual Sun, giving life and strength. The deeper the love the nearer to Himself. The deeper the love, the higher and profounder entrance is obtained into the Lord's kingdom.

This self-sacrificing love is the Divine fruit of the life of the Lord Jesus Christ in the soul. This life enters into the life of the individual and into the life of the Church; into all the relations of believers with their fellow-creatures, making human life continually a new and ever newer revelation of God, and at the same time preparing the true disciple of Christ for

that higher evolution, which is to restore to him his new spiritual body, his habitation from heaven, and so to give him his everlasting home with the Lord.

In the first stage of gathering into His kingdom the Lord does not even demand a past moral life—nothing but the desire of being conformed to His Divine image. He admits a Judas to His table—as the Corinthians admitted drunkards—and on the same terms as He admitted His own beloved disciple John. The Twelve quarrelled among themselves immediately after Supper (Luke xxii. 24). But all this does not affect the Lord's institution of a body of imperfect men—for He had no choice in the matter—to represent Him and His love to mankind; first amongst themselves in their social life, and then to do, as they were best able, His work in the world—to be the living manifestation of Himself to all around them.

The hearts of the selfish were to be won through the exhibition of brotherly love, and the conscience of each one was to be purified and elevated by the pervading conscience of the community. The outward Church by this process ever becoming a more perfect transcript and manifestation of the Lord, and the universal conscience becoming continually more spiritual and enlightened, and its influence deepening and penetrating through all depths of individual nature, by the power and life of the Lord working from centre to circumference in and through the whole, as His own body.

The example of the Lord is the Divine rule for all

His disciples. The self-renunciation and self-sacrifice of the Master is to be the law of the disciple. It is in this way only that sinners can be called to the higher life. But through the perverted celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Churches there is now no satisfactory provision for individual growth in the Christ-life, or for the conscience of the brotherhood enlightening the conscience of its individual members—of strengthening the weak, guiding the ignorant and restoring the erring.

In the present state of the Churches the members cannot be said to have a common conscience through their church-membership; and when they have, it is often a perverted one. The consciences of the most spiritual have no sufficient means of reflecting their light upon the minds of their brethren, and so it comes to pass that the conscience of a member of a Christian Church, except in the small matters of his own 'shibboleth,' is little more than the expression of a public opinion, which has its beginning in the world, and not in Christ.

Our Lord's method, as shown by the institution of the Supper, is heart-union first, and then the true life and loyal obedience will grow up with the increase of brotherly love. Unverifiable opinions and brain-life are measurably left to the individual. The head is sure to come right when the heart is won.

It may be noticed here that the Lord's command to break bread with each other at a common table is absolute and unconditional. The disciples were to become members of Christ's body by obeying this command. We shall have to notice, by-and-by, an

important difference in the form of the injunction with regard to drinking the Cup.

But the Lord's Supper—the 'breaking of bread' at a common table—is only the platform of the Christian family and social life. It is only the first step of Christian fellowship. It is the door of admission into the Lord's family. It is the acknowledgment and open profession of universal Christian brotherhood. It is simply the promise and vow of service. It is only in proportion as this Divine relationship of universal Christian brotherhood and service is accepted—embodied in act and made the rule of life—that there can be any spiritual growth in the image of his Saviour in the soul of the disciple, or any building up of the members of any local church that assemble together to call their Saviour to mind, by the exhibition of His Spirit in their midst. And this first outward sign of brotherhood is by the Lord's own institution, as we have already seen, 'taking food together at a common table in obedience to His command.'

The next—the second step of the Christian life as it is symbolized by the Cup—the voluntary drinking of the Cup of Christ—is the presentation of the body, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, by one long battle with all its lusts, until, in the strength of Christ, victory is attained ; conjoined with a meek and cheerful bearing of the burdens of other members of the body of Christ, to lighten the oppressive load, and to strengthen the burdened and suffering brother. In this way, and in this way only, by personal holiness, and bearing the burdens of his brethren, fellow-

members of Christ's body, can the disciple take upon himself the yoke of his Master Christ, and so receive the rest which He alone can give to those who come to Him. In this way, and in this way only, can the disciple unify himself with his Divine Saviour, and so, by putting himself in the channel of Divine grace, receive grace and strength for himself to help in time of need. 'Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me.'

The sap of Divine grace and love must flow freely through the disciple as a branch of the true vine if he intends to live for the purpose of spreading life through the tree. And this service he voluntarily takes upon himself by drinking the Cup. It is only by opening himself freely to the inspiration of Divine love, and as freely giving himself out in loving service to his brethren—the brethren of Christ, the members of the body of Christ—and in this way accepting the example of his Saviour as the rule of his own life, and the Divine inflowing of His Holy Spirit as the spiritual fountain and motive-power of his own behaviour and conduct—it is only thus that the disciple can be renewed into his Saviour's spiritual image and likeness. 'By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another.' 'This I command you, that ye love one another as I have loved you. Ye are My friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you' (John xiii. 34 ; xv. 14).

CHAPTER IV.

The Cup.—Meaning of ‘*diathēkē*.’—The New Covenant.—
I Cor. x. 16.—The Object of the Lord in the Institution of
the Supper.

WE now proceed to consider the second section of St. Paul’s narrative—that which relates to the institution of the Cup—the particulars of which narrative we must not forget that the Apostle declares he ‘received from the Lord.’

‘In like manner also, the cup, after they had supped, saying, This cup, is the new covenant in My own blood. This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me’ (xi. 25). ‘In like manner’ (*i.e.*, in the same way as He took the bread, gave thanks, and gave it to them that were reclining at table with Him), so also ‘He took the cup,’ gave thanks over it, and gave it to those present, saying, ‘This cup is the new covenant in My own blood. This do’ (or ‘Ye do this’), ‘as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.’

This is the whole Divine history of the institution of the Cup, which our Lord so solemnly emphasizes: ‘This cup is the new covenant in My own blood.’

We cannot too closely examine into the meaning

and application of these words, or too clearly apprehend the ideas which they express.

What is a covenant? A covenant is an agreement, or compact, stating terms by which relations of peace or of union are established between contending or estranged parties, and through which different and even opposite streams of thought and purpose are made to coalesce and to flow into one channel. Thus as between God and man. How can peaceful and harmonious relations be established between a holy God and sinful men? How can the thoughts and purposes of God in His supreme holiness be made to run in the same channel with the thoughts and purposes of sinful man? How can man again become the image and representative of his Maker—to be ever obedient to the inspirations of Divine love and truly reflect the Divine beneficence?

This is the problem which the New Covenant in Christ solves.

A human covenant* is an agreement, the terms

* We may here notice that 'diathēkē'—'covenant' like 'koinonia,' in reference to which it may be described as a 'koinonia' in embryo—has three integral elements in its constitution: 1. The contracting parties; 2. The terms of agreement; 3. The symbol of their expression.

Where there is a written language the third element has its expression in a document formally drawn up and signed, sealed, and witnessed by duly authorized officials, and now named a treaty; but as nature is older than letters or written language, these terms could be witnessed and ratified by any sign understood and recognised by both parties.

Thus when Laban and Jacob made a covenant of peace between themselves (Gen. xxi. 44-53), 'Jacob took a stone and set it up for a pillar, and Jacob's brethren gathered stones and made a heap of them,' as the sign of their joining in the covenant; and all the contracting parties 'ate bread together upon the heap'—

and conditions of which have been fully considered, and of set purpose solemnly entered into, by the contracting parties, and so cannot be broken or set aside by either of them without a violation of faith, duty, and conscience. A covenant is, therefore, irrevocable by either one of the parties who made it. But when the Christian Scriptures were written the word *διαθηκη* signified not only a covenant as above defined, but also a Will, which expresses a similar unchangeable relation, but which receives its unchangeable characteristic only by the death of the testator, which at once rendered revocation, or indeed any change, afterwards impossible.

It would seem that this unchangeable characteristic of the instrument, rather than its form, led the Jewish writers to use the word. There is no word known which more emphatically expressed the idea of an unchangeable condition, or of an immutable moral relation in human affairs. Any expression of the Divine will is of necessity unchangeable; but all God's promises of love and mercy to the Jewish people, that were associated with an outward fact, sign or symbol, handed down to succeeding generations, were regarded as so many covenants. The

'consecrated bread'—for Jacob killed and offered a sacrifice in the mountain, and called his brethren together to eat bread, and in such way settled their differences and made a covenant of peace between themselves.

The stone pillar and the heap of stones were thus constituted a witness of the covenant then made, a witness as real to the parties present as the most formal treaty drawn out and written on parchment, and signed and sealed after the custom of modern times.

symbol connected the promise with all who adopted it.

Indeed, the connecting symbol marks the technical difference between a promise and a covenant. The most notable covenant symbol of the Old Testament was circumcision, which was not only the symbol of the Abrahamic covenant, but was also the outward bond of union, a 'koinonia' of the Jewish people, as the Cup of the Lord is of the Christian Church. Circumcision brought every Jew into the scope of the promise made to Abraham. Drinking the Cup brings every Christian within the scope of the promise of salvation through Christ. The Cup is the symbol of the new covenant, as circumcision was of the old. If this covenant had dated from patriarchal times it would probably have been known as the Covenant of the Cup, but it had already been described in the prophetic writings as the New Covenant; and so our Lord speaks of it under this title: 'This cup is the new covenant in My own blood.'

What, then, is the New Covenant which is symbolized in the Cup?

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. viii. 8-11, quoting from the Prophet Jeremiah, chap. xxxi. 31-34, says: 'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt; for they continued not in My covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant which

I will make with the house of Israel ; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put My laws into their minds, and upon their hearts also will I write them ; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people. And they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord : for they shall all know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them : for I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their sins will I remember no more.'

Now we think there can be no doubt in the mind of any Christian reader that the New Covenant spoken of by the Lord in connection with the Cup is the same New Covenant which was predicted by the Prophet Jeremiah as the one which God would make with His people in the latter days ; and we see that in that covenant God promises to His people :

(1) The creation or evolution of a new and sinless nature, both intellectually and affectionally reflecting Himself, and consciously to itself revealing Himself in it.

(2) Forgiveness of past sins ; and

(3) Eternal reconciliation and union with Himself.

And the Lord embodies this covenant in the Cup : ' This cup is the new covenant in My own blood,' *i.e.*, in the blood of ' the Word become flesh,' which is the Divine natural human embodiment of the Spirit of God in Christ, and thus it becomes the Divine life and the Divine hope in humanity ; and so, by its extension into the human family, the Divine nature, the Divine life, which embodies all the laws of God ; and these same laws are written upon, or have their

germs in, the hearts of all who form the body of Christ.

We must, therefore, never forget that the end of the covenant, and of the work of Christ, is to unite God to His creature man—to make man the incarnation of God—so that His divinity may be objectively and consciously showed forth in His creature.

But no covenant has its fulfilment in its sign or expression merely. The peace and amity of nations consist in their mutual relations, and not in the written treaty. The New Covenant is not in the Cup alone. The Cup is only the symbol of the covenant. The covenant is, to use the Lord's own words, *ἐν τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι*—‘in My own blood.’

We have therefore to inquire into the Jewish meaning and use of the word *αἷμα*—‘blood.’

In the Mosaic Scriptures ‘the blood’ is declared to be ‘the life’ (Gen. ix. 4; Lev. xvii. 1-14; Deut. xii. 23). And as the quality of the stream is primarily determined by its source, the qualities and characteristics of the outflowing life show forth the nature of the blood. The essential characteristics of the life are the outcome and expression of the blood from which it springs. Character depends upon heredity. The blood of the tiger necessitates the life of the tiger, as also the blood of the domestic animals, the cow and the sheep, determines their natural characteristics. Not less does the blood of Christ—of the ‘Word made flesh’—necessitate His life and sacrifice.

But the word came to have a very different meaning and application. Men came practically to the knowledge of blood only on its being shed, and then all

living quality was gone from it. And so the word 'blood,' which originally signified 'life,' from being so commonly associated with 'blood that was shed,' became the ordinary word to express the fact implied in its exposure, of a violent death, or of life wilfully taken away or voluntarily offered up as a sacrifice. And this is its ordinary signification in the sacred Scriptures.

Thus when the people in public assembly demanded that Jesus should be crucified, " Pilate took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man : see ye to it. And all the people answered and said, His blood be on us and on our children ' (Matt. xxvii. 24, 25). Again, ' if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partners with them in the blood of the prophets ' (xxiii. 30). In Acts v. 28 the high priest, in addressing the Apostles, says to them : ' We straitly charged you not to speak in this name, and, behold, you have filled Jerusalem with your teaching, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us.'

When used metaphorically, the metaphor derives its force from the same idea. Thus Acts xviii. 6, when the Jews opposed themselves, and blasphemed, Paul shook out his raiment, and said unto them : ' Your blood be upon your own heads ; I am clean.' And again, xx. 26 : ' I am pure from the blood of all men.' In Acts xv. 29 the abstention from blood, enjoined by the Apostles on the Gentile converts, was abstention from murderous revenge, and from witnessing the gladiatorial games, which were then one of

the common amusements of the people. In Acts xx. 28, where the Church is spoken of as 'purchased by His own blood,' though the expression in this passage is somewhat peculiar, as probably referring to the Lord's own voluntary submission to death, rather than to the infliction of it by others; yet here, as in every place in the Pauline writings where he uses the phrase αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 'the blood of Christ,' he refers to His death upon the cross.

There is, however, a peculiarity in the words of our Lord here (1 Cor. xi. 25) which must not be overlooked, and which it is very difficult, if not impossible, to express in an English literal translation. The word αἷμα, 'blood,' in association with Jesus Christ, in every case in St. Paul's writings, except in the passage before us, and in 1 Cor. xi. 27, is construed with a genitive of the object, and so forms the phrase, 'the blood of Christ,' or 'the blood of His cross,' which, as we have already shown, signifies His death upon the cross. But the words here spoken by our Lord, ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι, 'in My own blood,' are, I believe, never used on any other occasion. The secondary meaning of 'blood,' as implying a violent death, seems to be excluded by the use of ἐμός, which is a personal possessive pronoun specially referring to, and involving in its direct meaning, present possession.

The word with such limitation could scarcely be used by our Lord to express the idea of His own death, and must therefore be held to include its universal attributes and characteristics.

Physiology has not yet developed the law by which

the psyche, spirit, soul, or life embodies itself on the natural plane in blood and flesh; though it is undoubtedly certain that, in some way or other such embodiment is accomplished through the operation of law.

In this sense the idea involved in the words 'Christ's own blood,' can be nothing less than the incarnation of Divine life in nature. And the New Covenant is in the life-blood of the Lord, which is a new Divine spiritual element let down into nature for its regeneration and Divine transformation. And in the degree that His Spirit enters into the human race as its informing, directing and controlling power, human blood will become the embodiment of His Spirit, and in such blood, the New Covenant in Christ will be visibly established on the earth, and salvation wrought out in ultimates.

But this supreme end of Christ's life on earth—the establishment of an organized instrumentality for the communication or transmission of His Spirit to men for regenerative purposes—can only be realized in Divine order by us, as we, in the fulness of the Lord's meaning, drink the Cup of the Covenant, *i.e.*, as we voluntarily, and with full purpose of heart, take upon ourselves, in the act, the needful conditions of the Christ life, first, in intention, purpose and resolve, and then by an outward life and behaviour corresponding to the motions of the Spirit within, present our bodies a living sacrifice to God.

'In My own blood,' therefore, as spoken by the living Jesus, the words must signify, 'In My own life-blood,' that is, the blood of His Incarnate Spirit.

They cannot be limited in meaning to His sacrifice upon the cross, though there need be no doubt that that sacrifice was the fruit of the life-blood out of which it sprang, and so, in a secondary or subsidiary, but still most important, sense, would be included in it. The Covenant-blood contained within itself that element of self-sacrifice which led the Lord Jesus to the cross; and which thus, in Scriptural language, purchased for the human race the blessings of salvation. And, as we have already seen, this Covenant of God in Christ was ratified by the Lord's death, and so through this death became an unchangeable covenant.

In perfect harmony with this view, the Prophet Isaiah (chap. xlii. 6, 7), in a passage that is generally supposed to refer to the Lord Jesus Christ, says: 'I, the Lord, have called *Thee* in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep *Thee* and give *Thee* for a covenant of the people; for a light of the Gentiles, to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house.' In chap. xlix. 8, we have the same idea: 'I will preserve *Thee* and give *Thee* for a covenant of the people, to raise up the land, to make them inherit the desolate heritages.' And a similar promise will be found in chap. lix. 20, 21.

It is a normal scientific fact that is taught in the Mosaic Scriptures that blood is the life. Blood is the embodiment of the psyche, or natural soul, and the blood of Jesus was nothing less than a Divine incarnation on the natural plane; and so it must, from its

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

own Divine 'dunamis,' or inherent power, eventually unify all human life with itself, as well as harmonize all lower forms of life with and from its own, and thus establish universally the Kingdom of God in nature. Except we eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, we have no life in us. Except we connect ourselves with the Divine source of life and feed upon it, and appropriate it, and assimilate it, our nature must remain in its natural state of alienation from God, and incapable of entering into His kingdom.

The Divine power of the Lord Jesus, manifested in healing the diseases of all who came to Him in faith for such purpose, is simply the same power that He puts forth now to lift up the souls of those who come to Him in faith for the purpose of being delivered from the power and dominion of sin, and so of being in holiness of life united to, and made one with Himself in the Kingdom of God.

We therefore interpret the words, 'the New Covenant in My own blood,' to mean, 'the New Covenant in the Word made flesh.' And these words, as spoken by the Lord, embrace the idea of His whole life—from his conception in the womb of the Virgin, to His death upon the cross—onwards to His resurrection from the dead, and to His glorification in heaven. The purpose of the Covenant of God in Christ—a phrase which involves His whole nature, and personality, and office—is to unite all things in Him both in heaven and earth, that all should confess His universal Lordship to the glory of God, the common Father.

Our Lord declares the Cup to be the Covenant ; that is, that in drinking it according to the Lord's purpose, it conjoins the participant to the Covenant and to the Life and Spirit of Christ ; and so, in this way, it becomes a revelation of the love of God to man and holds the mystery which is hidden under it ; that it symbolizes and expresses all the conditions of the Covenant as revealed in Jesus Christ, sanctification and self-sacrifice, faith and trust in God, so as to walk in the way of His providential appointments, even to martyrdom if the Divine wisdom and goodness should so will. All things work together for good to them that love God. It unites to the life and so to the blood of the Lord. The spiritual truth is shadowed forth in the symbol, 'This cup is the new covenant in My own blood.' The Cup is thus the bond of union, the 'koinonia' of Christ and His disciples. The Cup is the Covenant in the same sense that a written document may be called a covenant, or a treaty, or an agreement, or a bond of union. The written treaty and the Cup are each merely signs or symbols. Written words are the symbols of spoken words, as spoken words are symbols of ideas and purposes. Ideas and purposes in their objective results are symbols of life. Life—Spirit—is the one only truth, substance and reality.

A written treaty or agreement between God and man is an impossibility, but the inflowing spirit of God into the creaturely spirit of man is the source of all Divine human joy and blessedness. This new life figures itself out in symbolic ideas ; the ideas again in symbolic words, or equally significant signs

and emblems; and of such, the Cup, as symbolic of the experiences of human life, of varying fortune, or of fixed fate, in reference both to man and nations, is common to all ancient literature, and is universally recognised.

In the prophetic Scriptures of the Old Testament, the Cup is generally the symbol or emblem of judgment.* On the other hand, in the Psalms, it is the symbol or emblem of salvation.†

In the New Testament, our Lord several times uses the figure of the Cup as symbolic of His own life. 'Are ye able to drink the cup that I am drinking?' is the question he puts to James and John, when, in their blind ambition, they ask for the chief places of honour in the Kingdom of God (Mark x. 38; Matt. xx. 22). And on the confident expression of their opinion that they were able, He promises them that they shall. 'Ye shall indeed drink of My cup.' Poor ignorant men, how little they then knew for what they were asking, or the immediate meaning of what was promised to them!

When the cup of sorrow and anguish which the Lord Jesus was drinking to the very dregs became almost too great to be borne, He cries out, 'O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me' (Mark xiv. 36; Luke xxii. 42; Matt. xxvi. 39). And then, as if fresh strength were given Him in answer to His prayer, He at once resigns Himself to His Father's will: 'If this cup may not pass from

* Isa. li. 17, 22; Jer. xxv. 15, 17, 23; xlix. 12; li. 7; Ezekiel xxiii. 31, 32, 33; Hab. ii. 16.

† Ps. xi. 6; xvi. 5; lxxiii. 10; lxxv. 8; cxvi. 13.

Me except I drink it, Thy will be done' (Matt. xxvi. 42). And when Peter, in his hot haste, began to use the unhallowed weapon of physical force and destruction upon the Lord's enemies, he was met by a remonstrance, dictated by personal resolve, as well as by absolute submission to the Father's will, 'The cup which My Father has given Me, shall I not drink it?' (John xviii. 11.)

Hence we may see the ground of the emphasis of St. Paul's question (1 Cor. x. 16), 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not our "koinonia," 'our bond of union,' with the life-blood of Christ and with the sacrifice of Christ? Is it not the Divine centre, around which gather and radiate all the fruits of Christ's faithfulness, sufferings and self-sacrifice, at once the symbol of His finished work, the revelation and continued manifestation of His Divine love, and the source of all Divine spiritual life and strength to all subsequent generations?

But the subject under consideration at this moment presents an idea which has almost grown obsolete in modern Church Christianity. A Christian 'koinonia' or Church, as we have already seen, is a Divine social organization of believers in Christ—the outermost social embodiment of a Divine spiritual life. The human race has its 'koinonia' in flesh and blood. The human form is its symbol. But the flesh and blood of Christ is the 'koinonia' of a Divine humanity, and must be formed anew in us, before we can be the subjects of His salvation. That flesh, as the organ of His Spirit, ultimates itself in brotherhood and service. That blood, in like manner, ultimates itself

in self-sacrificing love. And so St. Paul, by this description of it, as the 'cup of blessing which we bless,' means, Is not the Cup (drinking which unites the loving disciple to the blood or sacrifice of Christ) the symbol, the evidence to us, of our Saviour's self-sacrificing love, which has delivered us from death and hell, and made us partakers of His holiness and glory, but which can only be ours as we enter into the spirit of that life, and embody it in our own—that life which is symbolized in the cup of the Supper, and which by drinking, we personally pledge ourselves to manifest and to embody in our own and so illustrate by our own example?

St. Paul connects all the blessings of the Christian Covenant with the blood or death of Christ; he never seems to tire of the idea. His statement of this doctrine to the Philippians is a good illustration of his manner of presenting the subject to his converts. 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus . . . who humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, yea, the death of the Cross. Wherefore God highly exalted Him, and gave unto Him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father' (Phil. ii. 5, 11).

It was not for Himself that the Lord Jesus lived and died, but for universal humanity, and especially for all who accepted Him as their Saviour. And all that He realized of glory and power to Himself by

His life's labours, was primarily for the enrichment of all His disciples, that 'they all might be one in Him and in the Father' (John xvii. 20-22).

But the outward symbol of communication was the Cup, and the channel of communication was drinking the Cup in the Spirit of Him who instituted the service. This to St. Paul was the way, and he knew no other way. But it is only as our drinking the Cup is the expression of our desire and resolve to become one with the Lord Jesus that the act has any true meaning or life.

The body must enter into the worship, and into the consecration. The body is thus declared to be one with the Spirit in all true and acceptable worship. The two are conjoined by God and may not be separated in any Divine act. Eating the bread and drinking the cup, considered as acts of the body, without the spirit of the man consciously and intelligently entering into the service, without a discernment of our being members of the body of Christ, without being animated by His spirit of loving unity with our fellow-members, brings judgment and not strength, alienation and not union. It is the perception of this fact which led the Apostle to beseech the Roman Church to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which he declared to be a duty involved in the service itself. And again, 'Whoever shall eat the bread or drink the Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be held in the body and blood of the Lord for judgment' (Appendix D). But by drinking the Cup in the Spirit, and according to the Divine ordinance of the Lord, we come to Him in

our conscious weakness and need for life and strength, as the disease-stricken suppliants of old, to be healed of our spiritual, as they of their natural, infirmities ; resolving in His strength to drink His Cup, if it should be the will of God with regard to ourselves, that we should be joint-partakers of His sufferings for the human race, assured that His love for His people has not grown less since He ascended to His Father's right hand in heaven, and that He is as ready now, as He was on earth, to fulfil His Divine promise, ' Ask, and ye shall receive.' But still it will be well to remember that no man can consecrate his life to Christ, until he has first consecrated it to the service of man. In Divine order the disciple must eat the bread, before he drinks the Cup.

We conclude, then, that the Cup is the Divinely appointed symbol, representing internally to the mind of Christ, and so expressing in Divine fulness to all His disciples, the Covenant of God in Himself for their eternal redemption from sin and death ; not simply a covenant in His death, nor in any specific act of His life, but in Himself as including His whole personality and His finished work ; the whole economy of human redemption, as embraced in the Divine purpose, through Him, from first principles to ultimates, from the first promise of salvation in time to its fulfilment in eternity. And that it is now open to every disciple to drink the Cup, and to enter into the Covenant, and so to ratify on his own behalf, as one of the contracting parties, the Covenant for himself.

The Cup of the New Covenant in the Lord's blood

is a symbol on which is stamped the very impress of the Divine truth it symbolizes and represents. It expresses both the Divine and human sides of the Lord's life ;—obedience to the Father's will absolutely realized, as well as the precedent resolution and effort to accomplish the end. And the promise of the Covenant is that if we voluntarily and with full purpose of heart drink it, and thus accept the Lord's life as the fountain and model of our own, and opening our hearts to the inflowing of the Divine Spirit show forth that life in our own, He will enter into us through our endeavour, and so become the source of a regenerated spiritual life, containing within itself the promise of a Divine natural life, and raise us up to His own Divine plane of existence, and thus unite us to Himself now and for ever.

The object of our Lord through the institution of the Supper, we may now clearly see, was first to unite His disciples in one body through their social and affectional qualities ; and then, in the Divine strength these qualities are capable of embodying, by His Spirit working in and through them, to consecrate all of His disciples to the service of each other as members of the one body of Christ ; and the Supper was the school or class in which they were to learn this Divine lesson.

In breaking bread together the natural courtesies of social life are brought into play, and would ordinarily prevent any rupture of social relations arising from differences of temperament and feeling ; while the increase of social affection in the Spirit of Christ resulting, would necessarily lead to that self-

abnegation in which mutual service would become the law of their daily lives.

And if, through the weakness of flesh, causes of disturbance from time to time should arise, drinking the Cup—looking to Jesus in the act—would of necessity turn every thought to Himself, teaching them the forgiveness of injuries, in which their own spiritual life and progress was bound up (Matt. vi. 14, 15); and would also lead to the needful sacrifice of all selfish feelings for the attainment of so good and holy an object as brotherly concord and unity, through which alone His Spirit could descend and work for their perfect regeneration, for the restoration of the image and likeness of God in their own souls, and for the spread of the Gospel in the world.

Each and all who sat down to supper were members of His body, whose duty and privilege it was to be animated by His Spirit, and to become one with Himself. But this union was progressive, and only to be attained and understood by experience; and so the new covenant was brought to the knowledge of men without any logical definition of its terms or its meaning. It was left to the experience of successive generations to evolve its creative life in greater and still greater fulness as they entered into, and had increased personal knowledge, of the truth of the Lord's promise that 'He would come to and make His abode with His disciples,' and so reveal Himself as an ever-living and regenerative Divine force delivering them from the power of sin, and uniting them to Himself, and by such union enabling them

to participate in His glory as well as in His sufferings.

But there is another idea which enters into this subject, that requires a special consideration, lying on the surface, and yet not realized as it ought to be, nay, scarcely reflected upon by many professing Christians of the present day. The Church has been so much in the habit of looking at the miraculous in the Lord's life, that it seems to have forgotten that law and order are essential elements which enter into and permeate the working kingdom of God—the Divine social evolution of human society. St. Paul develops this idea by referring to the mutual services of the different members of the body to each other. And this is as absolutely true of the Church as of the human body. The spirit—the life—works through all and each of its members. If one member is diseased all the members suffer from the infirmity. If one member rejoices all the members rejoice with it. And so the Spirit of Christ would immeasurably extend its power over the hearts of individuals, if all were spiritually healthy, and striving with one heart and one soul for the same end.

The strength and potency of fire depends upon the amount and concentration of the materials which supply the conflagration. Scatter the materials, and the fire ceases to glow. It is there, but the heat declines, and will soon be extinguished. Concentrate the materials, and the intensity of the heat is proportioned to the concentration.

The members of Christ's body stand too much aloof from each other. There is little union arising

from the love of Christ. What union exists in the Church even, is little more than the natural love of family and friends. No breaking down of the middle walls of partition between class and class. Nature first and Christ second in the hearts of His professed disciples! If only we could conceive of ten thousand men and women living in society imbued with the Spirit of Christ! How the Lord would exult in such triumphant result of His death! How His Spirit would pass electrically from heart to heart, and kindle the love of God in the mass with a potency hitherto unknown! We are all guilty. We restrain the work of the Lord in our own hearts, and then wonder that the Gospel has accomplished so little! The Lord never compels. He can only work in us, and by us, as we are willing to be wrought upon and to work with Him. It is only by thus opening the doors of our hearts to Him that He can enter into and sup with us.

Before the Church can become in any fulness of health the Lord's body, a new order of society must arise in it—an order that shall see in the building-up of humanity in the image of Christ, an object more worthy of the concentration of faculty than the acquisition of a fortune or a great name for one's self. And until this is realized, the Kingdom of God can never be realized upon earth.

CHAPTER V.

Consideration of the Lord's injunction, 'This do.'

WE now come to the injunction of our Lord in relation to the Cup ; *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, 'This do,' or, 'Ye do this whenever ye drink (it) in remembrance of Me'—To call Me to mind, to exhibit My love to the world.

It will be observed that this injunction is not absolute and unqualified, like that given in connection with the 'breaking of bread,' but leaves the doing of it, in some measure, to the free will and choice of the drinker.

The Greek word *ποιεῖτε*, 'poieite,' may be construed either as the imperative plural, or as the present tense of the indicative of 'poieo.' If taken as the imperative, it is a command : 'This do, whenever you drink (the cup being understood) in remembrance of Me.' If taken as the indicative form of the word, it is simply a declaration of something accomplished, doing, or done : 'Ye do this, whenever ye drink this cup in remembrance of Me.'

Obviously, the words spoken divide themselves into three clauses : (1) a command or affirmation ; (2) a condition ; and (3) a purpose or object.

1. 'This do; or, Ye do this,
2. 'Whenever ye drink (*it*)
3. 'In remembrance of Me;' or, 'to call Me to mind.'

With reference to the first clause we ask, What were the twelve commanded to do? or, What did they accomplish by drinking the cup in remembrance of the Lord?

Some interpret the words simply as meaning, 'Whenever ye drink this Cup, drink it in remembrance of Me.' But such construction is so tautological, and inept, as to be unsatisfactory in a very high degree. How was it possible for the disciples to drink the Cup of the New Covenant, without drinking it in remembrance of their Saviour?

Some think that there is in these words a special reference to one of the cups of wine, drunk as a part of the Passover feast; and that our Lord said in effect: 'Hereafter, when ye drink this Passover Cup, no longer drink it in remembrance of your deliverance from Egyptian bondage, but drink it in remembrance of Me.'

But when we consider that this view of the question would (1) limit its observance to those who partook of the Passover; and (2) that the Lord had already declared the Cup to be the New Covenant in His own blood; and (3) that the institution of the Cup—as the Covenant of God in Christ—infinately transcends the Jewish rite, in its importance and universality; and that it was to be drunk by all Christians alike, whether Jews or Gentiles; this view, also, seems to be utterly untenable.

If we take 'This do' as covering all the particulars

of the service, we must carefully ascertain what the Lord did on the occasion when the words were spoken. The Lord did four things :

1. He took the Cup in His hands.
2. He gave thanks over it.
3. He gave it to His disciples.
4. He spoke the words : ' This Cup is the New Covenant in My own blood. This do in remembrance of Me.'

Now, the disciple to whom the Cup was given must take it in his hands, and he would have necessarily to pass it on to his neighbour at the table. But he could not speak the words spoken by the Lord. The only thing possible for him to avoid doing was 'giving thanks over it;' but if this had been the Lord's meaning by the words 'This do,' might we not reasonably have expected Him to have said, 'Give thanks over the Cup whenever ye drink it in remembrance of Me'?

The fact is that the conditioning clause, 'as often as,' or 'whenever ye drink it,' cannot be satisfactorily harmonized with the words 'This do,' read as a Divine command. The intervening clause implies and pre-supposes conditions; implies and allows a certain liberty of judgment, and a freedom of action incompatible with a universal duty imposed by a Divine law, such as that enjoined in 'breaking the bread.'

Let us now turn our attention to the alternative construction of 'poieite,' as the second person plural of the present tense of the indicative mood; and read 'Ye do this,' You make this Covenant—you volun-

tarily enter into it, on your own behalf, as often as ye drink this Cup in remembrance of Me. By this act you accept and renew for yourselves the New Covenant of God in Me, and bring yourselves within its scope, and so for yourselves make God a party to its fulfilment. By drinking this Cup you accept it as the symbol of My life of self-renunciation and self-sacrifice for the good of the human race, and pledge yourselves to take Me for your example, and to walk in My footsteps as your pathway to immortal life. You thus make yourselves one with Me, in the object and purpose of your lives; and one with God, as fellow-workers with Him, in His Divine purpose of mercy to the human race. And God will thus unite you to Himself by an indissoluble bond enduring throughout eternity.'

We venture to think that this plain palpable meaning of the words of the Lord Jesus, is more worthy of the occasion, and more in harmony with the Divine Institution, than any meaning which can be drawn from them, if interpreted as a Divine command.

And to show that all the Apostle's further enunciations are in perfect harmony with this general view of the subject, we offer the following paraphrase of the entire passage, 1 Cor. xi. 23-34 :

'I received from the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was delivered up, took bread, and having given thanks, and distributed it amongst the disciples, said, This is My body, which is for you. This breaking of bread together as My disciples, after this example which you have seen, and which I

now institute, as the central fact of the life and form of My kingdom, till I return in the power and glory of My Father, shall be for all of you My bodily manifestation in ultimates ; for where two or three shall meet together in My name, there will I be in the midst of them, to enlighten, to guide, and to inform them by My spirit. Celebrate this service, which you have now joined in, continually, that we may bring each other to mind ; you by living in My spirit and following My example, and I by working through you as My chosen instruments to establish My kingdom upon earth.

‘ This Cup is the new Covenant now immediately to be ratified by My death, between My Father and your Father, and all His children of mankind. And you also, each one for himself, may enter into this covenant by drinking this Cup, to vitalize the relationship that human nature in Me, and universally through Me, holds with our Father in heaven ; I in Him and He in Me, that you and I may be one even as I and My Father are one. And thus by completing and perfecting the Divine relationship you shall become in an absolutely and perfectly regenerated nature, one with Me, and My Spirit shall pervade, and permeate, and vitalize your whole human personality ; till our wills shall be one with, and in, the will of our Heavenly Father, and He shall be glorified in each one of His children by their individual participation of Eternal Life in Me, and so become a Divine revelation and manifestation of His perfections and glory to eternity.

‘ Therefore,’ the Apostle continues, ‘ whenever you

shall eat this Bread and drink this Cup, alike sanctified by the prayers and thanksgivings of the assembled Church, in the Spirit of the Lord's love and self-sacrifice for man, you, by this solemn act, make a public proclamation of the Lord's death as the source of your own spiritual life and as the foundation of all Divine spiritual blessings for mankind, and at the same time by your example open its channels, so far as you are able, for the salvation of the whole human family. And so it comes that whoever shall eat the bread, or drink the Cup of the Lord (see Appendix D), unworthily, unfittingly, without due consideration of its solemn meaning, purpose, and object, will bring upon himself, by so doing, a judgment of condemnation from the body and blood of the Lord, which will not be slow in taking effect. Let each one, therefore, thoroughly test his own motives and examine into the spirit of his life; and only after such testing let him eat of the bread and drink of the Cup. For he who eats of the bread and drinks of the Cup without a discernment that he is a member of the Lord's body, with which he is by the act virtually connecting himself, eats and drinks a judgment upon himself, and on account of this very neglect, already many of you are affected with bodily ailments and infirmities, and even some from amongst you are sleeping in death, thus proving the truth of what I tell you, that they were "enochos," *i.e.*, that by so doing they brought upon themselves a Divine judgment of condemnation from the body and blood of the Lord, which they would have escaped if they had first tested themselves as to their fitness for joining in this service. Never-

theless by these judgments now in this present life they are chastened by the Lord in His mercy, here and now, that they may escape the condemnation that is coming upon the world of the ungodly, when our Lord comes in His Divine glory to establish His eternal kingdom.

‘So then, as the end of my present warnings, when you come together to eat the Lord’s Supper give to and receive from each other, in love and unity, of the bread which has been sanctified by common prayer and thanksgiving, and separate this solemn service from an ordinary meal. If anyone hunger, let him satisfy that hunger at home, that no one join in the service to his own condemnation. And all other things I will set in order when I come.’

The Lord’s Supper necessarily presupposes the presence of the Lord. Wherever the Lord’s Supper is eaten, He by His own promise is present, not as a mere human presence standing outside, and looking on with approbation, but as spiritually and personally operative in every soul, uniting it to Himself.

This great fact is often overlooked and seldom realized as it should be. The Lord by those words, ‘Ye do this,’ transfers His own life and life-work to His disciples assembling in His name. Whenever and wherever the bread is broken and the Cup is drunk in harmony with the Lord’s injunction, the Lord is in spiritual union with His disciples, and, so to speak, gathering them up into Himself—working in them and through them, so that in truth and fact He works the good of which they are the privileged

mediums. And so the Covenant of God in Him is renewed continually to His disciples by this serviv.

Hence we may see that in St. Paul's view of this solemn subject there is a very real and vital transubstantiation of the bread which is eaten in the Lord's Supper, but that it only takes place after digestion and assimilation in the body of the eater, who is a member of the body of Christ.

And secondly, that in drinking the Cup, and so accepting the self-sacrificing love of Christ as a living and ever operative spiritual principle in the believer's own soul, there is a true and real, but ever renewed, offering up of the Lord Christ in the person of His disciple. For it is only by virtue of the union of the Saviour with the believer that the offering could be made at all.

The vow to live after the example of Christ, and the corresponding consecration of the believer's life, are the fruit of the outflowing life of Christ in the disciple. As St. Paul says: 'It is not he, but Christ living in him,' that works in him and enables him to do the works. And as the experience of every good man will show how dreadful and agonizing a thing it is to live in an atmosphere of impurity—to bear the shame of another's sin with whom he is bound up by ties of relationship and love—so a corresponding agony, only manifoldly increased, must clearly be felt by the Saviour when He is engaged in uniting Himself to a sinful brother for the purpose of saving him from spiritual death and hell.

We are too ready to suppose that the Lord Jesus, being now at the right hand of the Father, knows

nothing of the indwelling sin of His disciples or the sufferings that flow from it ; but a little clear thought will show that sin is a spiritual disease, and to bear it away the Lord must take it into Himself, or it would never be extirpated from the human heart. And there is the same, only infinitely more poignant feeling, between the contact of sin and supreme holiness, as there is between sin and the sanctified human heart. We are to become one with Christ if we are to be saved by Him. There is only one body. The Lord must work in and through us, and unite Himself to us little by little until in our spiritual growth we shall unite the most perfect freedom of will with the most perfect surrender of self ; always and in everything seeking to do the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven.

CHAPTER VI.

The Organization of the Church.

ORGANIZATION is the great fact and evidence of life. Indeed, there can be no life embodied in nature without an organization to manifest it, and in due course to reproduce it; and the form and nature of the organization depends on the quality of the life. There is no natural species, no perfected form of organic life without power of reproduction. In like manner there can be no union of spiritual forces here on earth without an embodied organization, both for its outward manifestation and for the perpetuation of the force with which it is endowed.

The mission of the Lord Jesus Christ would have been lost to mankind if He had not, in some way or other, organized or planted His own Divine forces and attributes in human nature, with power of reproduction or of extension in the organization.

Our Lord Himself likened the kingdom of God to leaven, which a woman took and hid in meal, till the whole was leavened, and so made more capable of human bodily assimilation; as also to seed scattered by the sower, which found in the soil elements needful for its own growth and evolution, and for this purpose

appropriated them to its own use, and so grew into its perfected state, capable of reproducing itself, for the further supply of human wants and needs.

A deeper insight into the laws and operations of life would perhaps show a common fundamental principle in both of these methods of extension and growth.

But the great fact is that the Lord Jesus did plant the seed of His own Divine life in the natural human world—the world in which we live ; that He did form a human organization on earth, which He called His body, in which that life could find elements capable of harmonious conformation to itself, and suitable for its own sustenance and reproduction ; and that He did this while in full possession of all His natural conditions, powers, and attributes.

This life was first divinely organized in His own human body, as the Word made Flesh, through which body, by the operation of Divine natural methods of communication, He planted seeds of Divine knowledge in His sympathetic hearers. Willingness of reception was the one condition of the human soil required for the planting of the Divine seed. Where two or three meet together, animated by the same feelings, sympathies and desires, there is a mutual invigoration, arising from the inflowing and interflowing Divine life, embodied in the words spoken and in the affections created, and in this way communicated to and through the souls of the assembled disciples to each other. This Divine spiritual knowledge thus impregnating the mind, and this Divine spiritual life thus animating the hearts of the recipients, is the reproduction of the same Divine life that first had

its human habitation in the body of the Lord Jesus; and so, through this channel, the infinite fountain of Divine truth and love is opened up to mankind, bringing man into heavenly relations and conditions; lifting him out of, and raising him above, nature, and so preparing him for evolution into the next higher degree of life for which he was ordained.

This second human extension, or embodiment, of the Spirit of the Lord Jesus, and which He called His 'body,' St. Paul called 'the Ecclesia'—'the Church.' So long as men obey and voluntarily give themselves up to the spiritual inspirations of the Lord, they are as truly members of His body as the members of His flesh and blood form, known as Jesus, in Capernaum. The organization known as the Church only ceases to be His body when it becomes subject to the depraved natural motions of its members seeking to make it the ground of the gratification of their own self-love and evil cupidities.

There was no word of expression so appropriate or suited to the needs of the occasion as that of 'My body,' when the Lord instituted the Supper for His perpetual memorial. The word taught and embodied His own relations to mankind.

A new Spirit from God had descended into nature; first into and through the body and flesh of the Lord Jesus, and then through the Lord Jesus into humanity. But it was the same Spirit—the same Word of God—the same Divine life coming to work through and embody itself in mankind, that was already in operation in Him, and it could only work on the same lines and show itself in similar fruit. St. Paul

never lost sight of this ; but to distinguish the individual societies he formed from all other societies of Jews and Gentiles, he named them 'ecclesia' (which has, somehow, not very clearly, got translated into the word 'Church'), which has for its root-meaning the idea of being 'called out.' But in St. Paul's sense the word could have had no existence before, because the idea embodied in it was only then in process of evolution and formation ; but still he held before his own mind, and ever kept steadily in view, the grander idea and the grander phrase, which represents the origin and constitution of the Churches as 'the body of Christ.'

The Gentile world knew nothing of the body of Christ. The Jewish world repudiated it. The Jewish people regarded themselves as the people of God, and their organized community as the kingdom of God. They derived their existence from Abraham, their name from Israel, their national organization from Moses, their kingdom from David ; and such inheritance and such birthright privileges were, in their estimation, a greater honour than any the crucified Jesus of Nazareth could confer. The Jew, even when he accepted the Lord Jesus as the Christ, had no ambition to put on the outward garb of the Christian name—to lose the nationality which he held in himself by becoming a member of the body of Christ. 'The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch.' This name broke down the middle wall of partition between him and the Gentile. Such change of name could not fail to be regarded as a degradation of national character and privilege. He looked upon

the Messiah as belonging of Divine right to himself and his nation, a possession which of itself separated him from, rather than united him to, the Gentile world. The very office of the Christ was to serve the ambitious hopes of himself and his nation. To be a member of the body of Christ, reduced him at once to the level of the hated Gentiles, and this feeling of national pride the Jew never overcame. We see here ground and motive enough for the Jew to seek another meaning for the words, "This is My body," than that which they intended to convey; and the priestly element permeating fallen, sinful humanity, supplied all that was wanting to present the perverted idea acceptably to the ignorant and superstitious Jewish and Gentile mind.

Far different the Apostle Paul. He glories in the faith that he was a member of the body of Christ. To him it was the greatest honour, the noblest privilege of discipleship. But the Jewish Apostles James and Peter ignored both the fact and the idea. And we have no reason to suppose that either of them ever realized the Divine truth that the Gentile Christian was the equal of his Jewish brother. We know that some twenty years, or thereabouts, after Peter had received a special revelation on the subject, that Gentiles were to be received into the Church, and therefore, as members of Christ's body, were to be admitted to equal privileges with himself in that relation, he would not sit down with his Gentile brother at the Lord's table in Antioch (Gal. ii. 11, 12). And that this feeling was predominant among the Jews, there is abundant evidence to prove.

Indeed, previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jewish members of the Church never seem to have risen above their Judaism. And after the destruction of Jerusalem, which gave the death-blow to their Messianic hopes, the Jewish nation universally rejected Jesus as their Messiah, and a body of Christians 'zealous of the law' at once ceased to exist. The leaders of the Church in Jerusalem pandered to the exclusiveness of their followers. In obedience to this feeling they prevailed on Paul to act the hypocrite by presenting himself before the Jews publicly in a form which was alien to his character. And their only excuse was, 'Thou seest, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews of them that have believed, and they are all zealous for the law' (Acts xxi. 20).

The first lesson of the religion of Christ is brotherhood and equality in the Church, as members of one body; but in the opinion of these leaders of the Church—these pre-eminent Apostles, as St. Paul names them (2 Cor. xi. 5)—believers who acknowledged their authority, could be members of the Church of Christ, not only before they had learned the first lesson of Christian brotherhood, but even without practising the simplest duties involved in the relationship.

A false doctrine, like that of the Greek and Romish transubstantiation, would naturally take some time before it could establish itself as the orthodox doctrine. That it was beginning to show itself in St. Paul's days is, we think, abundantly manifest from his later epistles, those to the Ephesians and Colossians.

It is scarcely conceivable that St. Paul could have so emphasized his doctrine of the Church being the body of Christ if he had not been driven to it by a perception of the danger of the false doctrine of the bread of the Lord's Supper being the body of Christ, which he saw was then entering the Church, and spreading more widely, and which clearly required for its suppression such emphasis of statement. As time passes on we have historical evidence of the development of the false doctrine. The third of the synoptic Gospels, which bears the name of St. Luke, and which is the oldest of the synoptics in their present form, contains a narrative almost identical with St. Paul's, and certainly contains nothing that cannot be harmonized with it. The first development of the Jewish doctrine is found in the second Gospel attributed to St. Mark, which probably had its origin in the Jewish church at Alexandria. Not till we arrive at the one now named after St. Matthew, is it that we have the first full liturgical form of the perverted doctrine which has become the keynote of all the later Eastern and Latin liturgies.

That this doctrine was not received by a large number of the Churches at the beginning of the second century is evident from the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,' which on this point is in perfect agreement with St. Paul. And the well-known letter of Pliny, written in the first decade of the second century, shows that the Christians of Bithynia and Pontus, at that period, ate the Lord's Supper as an evening meal.

The first form of the celebration of the Lord's

Supper by the Churches was an imitation of the last supper of the Lord with His disciples. While other kinds of food had been, and perhaps were on the table, the Lord specially emphasized bread as the one article of His memorial feast.

We can easily see how Divine honours began to be paid to the loaf, the eating of which formed so important a part in the daily worship and organization of the Church, without charging the first teachers of the doctrine with any designed falsehood. We must remember that eating the bread was a seal of the eater being a member of the Church—of the body of Christ. How easy, how natural for the ignorant and superstitious disciple to believe that the bread with such associations must have Divine properties and attributes; and when such a faith came into existence on the part of an ignorant and superstitious people, the teachers, sympathizing with the mental condition of the taught, by changing the application of the words, might gradually grow into a faith which had so much in it to appeal at one and the same time to the love of mystery in the human heart, and their own personal interests, for persuasion, extenuation, justification, and reception.

The inseparable symbol would gradually concentrate upon itself the attention and regard due to the thing signified. We cannot suppose that conversion, however important to the individual himself, and however great the change wrought in his spiritual nature, would remove all traces of previous nature and habit. And when a priest, Jewish or pagan, entered the Church, he necessarily brought with him much, if not all his ignorance, a large measure of his

superstition, and some, at least, of his priestly associations and assumptions. Certainly he would bring with him some of that desire for personal deference to which he had been accustomed. And ordinary courtesy of itself would lead his new friends to pay him honour. As priest-president of the assembly, he would often lead in prayer and thanksgiving, and in conducting the regular services of the Church. The phrase, 'This is My body,' as a part of the service spoken while the bread was in the hands of the speaker, when the eyes of the assembled worshippers were directed to him and it, would naturally grow to be connected with the bread which was broken, and the true idea of the transubstantiation of the body of the eater into the body of Christ would easily be transferred by the equally ignorant, superstitious, and it might be perhaps designing priest, who saw in the rite the foundation of his own office and personal dignity, to the bread which formed so prominent an element in the service.

Jewish exclusiveness and Jewish superstition laid the foundations of the new and false doctrine, and priestcraft fixed the coping-stone.

That this is substantially the history of the origin of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, though we cannot now offer specific evidence of the fact in all its details, is as certain as that the doctrine arose in the Church on the ruins of the institution of the Lord's Supper.

The Church of Christ knows nothing of priests or a priesthood, other than the fact that all the Lord's people are priests, and that the Christian priesthood is co-extensive with the Church.

But the same superstitious element in human nature

that began to see in the bread of the Lord's Supper the body of Christ, gave birth also to the necessity of a separate priest to stand and mediate between the Lord and His people. The false doctrine and the false priesthood support each other, and they stand or fall together.

And there can be no return to the first and true faith of the Church, until 'the body of Christ' is identified with the union of all true believers in Him ; nor any spread of the true Christian life until each Christian realizes the nobility of the privilege to which he is called, as one of a Divine brotherhood, which in its fulness constitutes the body of Christ—the fulness of God in Him—the symbol of which brotherhood and body is a common family table, which thus becomes the table of the Lord ; nor until he recognises as the principle of duty towards his brethren of this Divine brotherhood—the Church which is the Lord's body—the consecration of all faculty and power and influence, as opportunity allows, to its service. And this consecration has its symbol in the Cup ; nor until he further recognises as his principle of duty towards the world and the flesh the self-denial, the self-renunciation of the Lord Jesus, which has its symbol in the Cross.

These three symbols, the Cross, the Table, and the Cup, include and express the whole circle of the Christian life ; and are each equally essential to its true ideal, as the practice of the corresponding duty expressed by and involved in the symbol is also essential to the attainment of the Divine inheritance, purchased by the Lord Jesus Christ for all who love and serve in His Spirit—the crown of everlasting life.

APPENDIX A, page 7.

‘KOINONIA.’—We have seen that ‘koinonia’ has for its primary meaning, a society, a partnership, a brotherhood; possessing, enjoying, or participating in common; oneness, or unity of a number, for a common object or purpose; and that the word is also used to express the common bond or purpose of union; and, lastly, to express the symbol employed to give a recognised expression to the union itself. But it is clear that it cannot mean, and never does mean, any separate participation of the privileges which belong to the partnership or brotherhood collectively.

Thus an army is a ‘koinonia,’ but the word could not be applied to express the dignity, or status, or rank, or emoluments, or privileges of any one of the body. The kingdom of England is a ‘koinonia,’ with a variety of symbols; *e.g.*, the national standard, the national flag, the great seal; but the symbols express the unity of the whole, not of any individual participation in or of them.

Thus the symbol of Government is the Parliament, but the word ‘koinonia’ could not be used to distinguish the special privileges of any individual member of that Parliament.

The national flag is a ‘koinonia,’ but only because it is the symbol of the nation. It cannot be divided. The great seal may be described by the word, but only because it is the symbol of the kingdom.

The word 'koinonia' occurs nineteen times in the New Testament: once in Acts ii. 42; thirteen times in the Epistles of St. Paul (Romans xx. 26; 1 Cor. i. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 14, viii. 4, ix. 13, x. 16, and xiii. 14; Gal. ii. 9; Philip. i. 5, ii. 1, and iii. 10; Philemon, verse 6; once in Hebrews xiii. 16; four times in 1 John i. 3, 6, 7).

The revised translation renders the word twelve times by 'fellowship,' three times by 'communion' (with the marginal reading of 'participation'), and once by 'communication;' twice by 'contribution,' and once by 'to communicate.'

The word, as we have seen, expresses a simple and clear idea; and while there can be no doubt that its uses are somewhat elastic, in relation to the variety of facts it is connected with in the Apostle's writings, its root idea is always there, and can never be lost sight of, except at the expense of truth and rationality. And the ideas of union and collective or united possession can never be expressed by words which signify individual and separate participation.

Let us take these passages seriatim.

Acts ii. 42.—The exact meaning of the word in this passage admits of no certain explanation. But it seems to indicate the fact that the Christian disciples were being organized, and had been so up to a certain point, and so far were a 'koinonia.' But also, which is important to notice, that they had then no other name to express their union. The word 'church' in its Christian sense had no existence at this period. The historian does not record that the three thousand converts of the previous day were admitted to any Church, but that they 'employed themselves in listening to, and accepting the teachings of the Apostles;' and were faithful to the obligations of the unity—'koinonia'—thence derived and openly manifested and shown in the breaking of bread, 'and

in the daily prayers' of the Temple. And the recognition and fulfilment of these common services and duties formed the members into a 'koinonia.'

Romans xv. 26: 'For it has been the good pleasure of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain "koinonia" contribution for the poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem.' We have already spoken of the use of the word as somewhat elastic, and the meaning 'contribution,' which it undoubtedly has in this passage, may be looked at as an illustration of the fact. The use of the word here is an illustration of its meaning as the symbol or formal sign of the "koinonia," which was composed of the benevolent donators to the fund. There is also a third koinonia connected with this business (see 1 Cor. xvi. 4), or, as we should have named it, a committee appointed for the special purpose of carrying the money to Jerusalem and administering the relief for which it was intended. The 'poor Jews' in Jerusalem formed no part of these 'koinonias.' They only shared in the division of the common fund which by the process was dissolved.

1 Corinthians i. 9: 'God is faithful, by whom ye were called into the "koinonia" of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.' What the Apostle means by 'koinonia' here is what he describes in his Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 9), as the 'mystery of God's will, that He would *unite* all things in the heavens and in the earth in the Christ;' and which is exactly what our Lord prayed for after the Supper: 'Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; even as thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me. And the glory which Thou hast given Me I have given them; that they may be One, even as we are One; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into unity;

that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them, as Thou lovedst Me' (John xvii. 20-23).

1 Corinthians x. 16 we have already fully considered.

2 Corinthians vi. 14.—The Apostle here asks the question, 'What "koinonia" hath light with darkness?' What common ground of union is there between the two elements?

2 Corinthians viii. 4: 'Pressing upon us the care of this fund' (their united subscriptions for the poor Christians in Jerusalem) 'and that we should form a "koinonia"'—a committee, a united body specially appointed for the service.

We have already had occasion to refer to this matter in our observations upon Romans xv. 26.

The diaconate for the administration of the fund was a 'koinonia' specially called into existence for this purpose.

2 Corinthians ix. 12, 13.—For the performance of this relief service not only abundantly meets the wants of the saints, but calls forth much thankfulness to God—the service itself thus bringing glory to God, and being at the same time the proof of your having taken your place in the ranks of open confession to the Gospel of Christ; as well as to the liberality (of the 'koinonia') of your contribution (*i.e.*, of the fund formed by their united donations for the purpose of relieving indigent Jews at Jerusalem), for the benefit of those for whom you intended it.

2 Corinthians xiii. 14: 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God, and the "koinonia" of the Holy Spirit'—*i.e.*, the Divine bond of union with Christ—'be with you all.'

Galatians ii. 9: 'When they saw that I was entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter was with the Gospel of the circumcision, James and Cephas and John gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of "koinonia"'—*i.e.*, gave full expression

by the union of their hands with ours, to their spiritual sympathy and cordial union with us, in our purposes, as we also with them in theirs—‘that we should go unto the Gentiles as the field of labour we assigned to ourselves ; and they unto the circumcision ; only they would that we should remember the poor, which I also was earnestly desirous of doing.’

Philippians i. 5 : ‘I thank my God . . . for your “koinonia” in the Gospel, from the first day until now’—*i.e.*, for your fellowship or partnership with us in the Gospel, from the first day until now.

Chap. ii. 1 : ‘If there be any “koinonia”—any unity—of spirit, fill up the measure of my joy, that ye be of the same mind, having the same love, (being) one-souled, thinking in harmony.’

Chap. iii. 10 : ‘That I may know Him and the Divine force of His resurrection, and the “koinonia” of’ (be united with Him in) ‘His sufferings even by conformation to His death, if only I could attain unto the resurrection from the dead.’

Philemon, verses 4, 6 : ‘I thank my God, making mention of thee in my prayers. . . . that the “koinonia”’ (the uniting bond) ‘of thy faith may become effectual in the knowledge of every good thing in us unto Christ.’

Hebrews xiii. 16 : ‘To do good and to communicate forget not.’ The use of the word here, like its use in Acts ii. 42, gives no help to the reader to ascertain the exact meaning of the writer.

But the sentiment expressed is clearly this : Be not unmindful of the common charities of life, and of the brotherhood to which you belong.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, like James and Peter, ignores the Pauline use of the word ‘*ekklesia*.’ He could not use the word ‘synagogue’ to describe a local assembly of believers, and so it would seem he took refuge in ‘*koinonia*.’

The Christians in Jerusalem, no doubt, had their

own 'koinonias'—special meetings for Christian instruction, for prayer and praise. But underneath this, and outside of this, they were still Jews, and they frequented the Temple services as part of their religious duties. They were essentially Jews, accepting Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, and that only. They were dogmatically farther from the Pauline conception of the Christ than the heathen Gentiles were.

It is not improbable that the 'eupoiā' and the 'koinonia' spoken of in this passage were guilds or societies formed for the purpose of relieving distress, as well as for cultivating spirituality of mind amongst brethren who lived in the same neighbourhood, and that for such purposes periodical contributions to a common fund were made by the members.

I John i. 3, 6, 7: 'That which we have seen and heard we declare unto you also, that ye may have "koinonia" with us; yea, and our "koinonia" is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. . . . If any say that we have "koinonia" with Him, and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; but if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have "koinonia" one with the other.' The word repeated four times in these three verses has without doubt its ordinary Scriptural meaning—oneness, union, or unity; the meaning of the petitions in our Lord's intercessory prayer; the meaning involved in the Apostle's phrase, 'the body of Christ'—a dynamic spiritual union of the Lord with His people—ONE BODY, ONE SPIRIT, and God the Universal Father, through His Son Jesus Christ, ALL in ALL.

APPENDIX B, pages 15, 21, 31.

'SOMA.'—At the risk of some repetition, it will not be without use to consider this subject on purely philological and scientific grounds, to show by an analytic and exhaustive process the meanings and applications

of the word 'soma' as they are found in the New Testament.

There is no difficulty in the word itself. It expresses no mystery, is not even tinged with imagination. It is quite a prosaic, commonplace word. Its synonym is found in every known language, and the idea expressed by it is common to the universal thought of mankind.

'Body,' which is the English translation of 'soma,' when used in relation to man or the animal creation, may be described as a natural organism intended for the performance and fulfilment of the common functions of natural life ; as the external, natural, material clothing of the psyche whose form it takes ; as a form holding within itself in the various stages of its existence the capacity and power needful for its own growth and reproduction, as the ultimate of Spirit or spiritual force or forces so working together in harmony. But as no human language, which mainly exists for the expression of common needs and feelings, can retain a purely scientific character, the word 'body,' which primarily expresses the idea of an organism connected with life and motion, is used also to signify the form of the organism so long as it retains its original shape after the life has departed from it.

The body is the outward form of the man, and the word is commonly used in the New Testament for the expression of the idea of a visibly separate and individual member of the human race ; as a rhetorical expression emphasizing individuality. But the word is not only applied to express or signify that congeries of organs which in the form of man or animal is said to live and die, to work and rest, to wake and sleep. It is also applied to any sufficient number of individuals who are connected or united in purpose for a common object. Thus we speak of the 'body' of the people, the 'body' of an army, the 'body' of a congregation. Any union of men who acknowledge a

common law, or follow a common impulse, or who submit themselves to a common spiritual control, may be described as a body; and it may also be applied figuratively to signify any congeries of organic substances, or elements acting in unison by natural law.

There is no 'soma,' or 'body,' as the word is used in the New Testament, except under one or other of these conditions.

Every 'soma,' or 'body,' is thus primarily the external symbol, or sign, of an internal psyche, or motive force, which gives to it its special form and character.

The 'soma,' then, is an organ for the manifestation of life, or some self-moving power, or it may, for a time, be applied to the continuous form of the organ after the life has departed from it; or it is called into existence by a common purpose of a number consciously, or even unconsciously, uniting and working together in harmony. There is no exception to these conditions, and therefore the Lord, when He said, 'This is My body'—in using the word must have had in His mind, if He used the word intelligently, and what Christian can doubt it?—the disciples who were united by a common faith in Him, and animated by His Spirit dwelling in them. Upon what other imaginable condition can the Apostle Paul have derived his doctrine of the Church being the body of Christ?

The disciples of Christ considered as a Church are a 'body,' by virtue of their common faith in Him as their Saviour; and in and through the Supper he acknowledges them as such. 'This breaking of bread together in remembrance of Me,' for the 'renewal of My memory, makes'—constitutes—'you My body.' They were His body by virtue of their spiritual union with Him.

The idea of the piece of bread, made by human hands, having neither life nor motion, which He broke to His disciples, being the body spoken of, is utterly

irrational and impossible. It cannot be found in the words spoken. It has no foundation in the meaning of the word, or in the possibilities of fact. The Lord could not have used the words which the compiler of the first Gospel has put into His mouth. The Lord's words have been falsified, and the false doctrine has been built upon their falsification. The Lord did not speak the words, 'Take, eat,' for if He had, the fact would have been communicated to the Apostle Paul for him so to teach the Churches he formed. The Supper is not a sacrament as that word is defined by the theologians, of which dogma not a trace is to be found in the Apostle's writings, but a social institution, holding within itself the kingdom of God, which the Lord Jesus came to establish upon the earth.

The words actually spoken by our Lord on this occasion, as reported by the Apostle Paul, not only do not teach the doctrine of transubstantiation, they cannot even hold it. If the Lord had intended to reveal such a doctrine, He must have taught it by another form of words. As the facts stand before us at the present time, the word 'artos' ('bread') cannot be connected with the word 'touto' ('this'). They are separated by the impassable gulf of grammatical gender. The word 'touto' ('this') can only be grammatically construed with the word 'deipnon' ('supper'), or with the general idea involved in the phrase 'breaking of bread' by a number; and this done with the object and purpose of renewing the memory of the Lord Christ; which act constitutes the communicants the outward body of Christ.

The word 'soma' ('body') occurs in the New Testament some 145 times.

In ninety-two of these passages (*a*) the word expresses a general idea of an animal creature, or the idea of a definite, or of an abstract human or other personality, or the external appearance of a Divine or spiritual life.

In four (*b*) it expresses the external of vegetable life.

In twenty-three (*c*) it is found in connection with the phrase 'body of Christ' expressed or understood. But this only in the writings of St. Paul. There are two passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews where 'soma' is connected with 'Christ.' The first, x. 5, a quotation from Psalm xl.: 'a body hast Thou prepared for Me.' The second, x. 10: 'We have been sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.' And one in the Epistle of Peter, ii. 24: '... who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree.' But it is clear that the writers in each instance had in view the body which was crucified. No other New Testament writer grasped the Pauline idea of the Church being 'the body of Christ.'

In four passages (*d*) it occurs in connection with the Lord's Supper.

In twenty-one passages (*e*) it signifies a human or animal organism from which the life has departed. In thirteen of these passages it refers to the crucified body of the Lord Jesus.

In one passage (*f*) it signifies the whole body of Jewish Christians.

a. Matt. v. 29, 30; vi. 22, 22, 23, 25, 25; x. 28, 28; xxvi. 12. Mark v. 29; xiv. 8. Luke xi. 34, 34, 34, 36; xii. 4, 22, 23. John ii. 21. Rom. i. 24; iv. 19; vi. 6, 12; vii. 24; viii. 10, 11, 13, 23; xii. 1, 4. 1 Cor. v. 3; vi. 13, 13, 16, 18, 18, 19, 20; vii. 4, 4, 34; ix. 27; xii. 12, 12, 12, 14, 15, 15, 16, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25; xiii. 3; xv. 40, 40, 44, 44, 44. 2 Cor. iv. 10, 10; v. 6, 8, 10; xii. 2, 2, 3, 3. Gal. vi. 17. Eph. v. 28. Phil. i. 20; iii. 21. Col. i. 22; ii. 11, 23. 1 Thess. v. 23. Heb. x. 5, 10, 22. James ii. 16; iii. 2, 3, 6. 1 Peter ii. 24. Rev. xviii. 13.

b. 1 Cor. xv. 35, 37, 38, 38.

c. Rom. vii. 4; xii. 5. 1 Cor. vi. 15; x. 16, 17; xi. 27, 29; xii. 13, 17. Eph. i. 23; ii. 16; iv. 4, 12, 16, 16; v. 23, 30. Phil. iii. 21. Col. i. 18, 24; ii. 17, 19; iii. 15.

d. Matt. xxvi. 26. Mark xiv. 22. Luke xxii. 19. I Cor. xi. 24.

e. Matt. xiv. 12; xxvii. 52, 58, 58, 59. Mark xv. 43, 45. Luke xvii. 37; xxiii. 52, 55; xxiv. 3, 23. John xix. 31, 38, 38, 40; xx. 12. Acts ix. 40. Heb. xii. 11. James ii. 26. Jude, verse 9.

f. Heb. xii. 23.

Life, or a conscious purpose that has its origin in life, lies at the foundation, and is the operating cause of every 'soma' or 'body' described or referred to in the New Testament Scriptures. So long as the spirit or psyche is there the 'soma' lives; when the spirit departs, and no preservative influence takes its place, the 'body' soon comes to nothing and is forgotten.

The bread eaten at the Lord's Supper does not live, neither has it any conscious purpose. To worship it is to worship as very a fetish as the Mumbo-jumbo of the benighted African; and the lesson, which the reception of such a doctrine by so many millions of rational human beings teaches, is this: that in spite of man's blindness, and selfishness, and sinfulness, he still clings to a faith in God, that cannot be obliterated from the human heart.

If he is not conscious of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ revealing Himself to him, inclining his will to good, and inspiring a horror of sin, he may sink into the lowest depths of intellectual debasement, and even find there a God suited to his conscious wants. And the Father, in His infinite mercy, accepts this faith in the fetish, when it holds in its core the Divine principle of human brotherhood, as the highest and most spiritual offering His worshipper is at present able to give Him. And it is possible that even such a faith may be found in connection with aspirations after good, more profound and constant than those of the Pharisee of intellectual pride, who thanks God he is not so benighted as this poor creature he looks down upon.

It teaches, too, the depth of impressibility of the infant mind by religious doctrine. If the infant mind were not designedly taken possession of, and faith in this bread fetish stamped upon its tender conscience as the truth of God, such a monstrous doctrine would never have been accepted as the faith of millions.

There is another important lesson, too, which this wide-spread doctrine teaches. It shows that the destinies of the human race are in its own hands. If a priesthood working against God can yet mould the intellectual character of so many millions, what could not be effected by an equal society of men working with God to regenerate the race and work out His Divine purposes of love and mercy to the whole human family !

Yet superstition is not so much the enemy of God as intellectual pride and exclusiveness. Superstition may be associated with much brotherly feeling and desire of service ; but pride, from whatever cause, which builds up a wall of separation between its possessor and those whom it despises, shuts itself out, and everything belonging to it, from the kingdom of Heaven, and from the light of God's countenance ; and is murderously hostile to the work of the Saviour and the evolution of the Divine image in the soul of man.

The perfect man is the true symbol of God. To such an one we owe all reverence and all obedience. And so, as it were, instinctively the Christian world has ever looked upon the Lord Jesus Christ. But though the perfect man is the true symbol of God, all men possess that image or its seed germ in themselves. And by virtue of this Divine possession every son of man is entitled to the brotherly regard of his brethren, to reverence as a brother man created in the image of God, and, so far as his brother can see in him that image, to union with him.

If religion has any meaning and any use in the world, it surely must be to evolve this Divine image

fully in all who accept it and make use of it as a rule of life. The special work of religion is to lift up. The religious man must be the burden-bearer, must reverence the sinner for the possibilities that lie in him, as well as the saint for what he has achieved. Without the grace of God we should all be workers of evil.

APPENDIX C, page 18.

WE would here carry on the inquiry by a fuller examination of the subject—limiting our observations to grammatical and logical considerations—what our Lord referred to when He said, ‘This is My body for you.’ The word ‘this’ must refer to something not verbally expressed. What was that something? It must have been something present and visible, and something having relation to the words which the twelve Apostles present could understand. And there are only two things with which the word ‘this’ can possibly be connected, either (1) to the bread which *had been* broken, *i.e.*, distributed amongst the company, and which was then being eaten when the words were spoken, or (2) to the company around the table, amongst whom the bread had been broken. There is no other alternative. The Apostle says, ‘The Lord Jesus . . . took bread . . . and brake it, and said, This is My body, which is for you,’ xi. 23, 24. Bread is a generic name for all kinds of food in the Old and New Testaments. But it was not *until after* He had broken the bread, *i.e.*, distributed it amongst the twelve, that He spake the words, ‘This is My body, which is for you.’ The distribution of the bread amongst the twelve was an *accomplished fact* when the words were spoken. A little consideration will show that the word ‘this’ when spoken could not refer to a divided and distributed loaf. Literally and logically this disposes of the presumption that the bread was the body spoken of.

Without violence to the words they will not admit of any such meaning. The compiler of Matthew's Gospel saw this clearly enough, and so he adds after Jesus 'had broken the bread,' on giving it to His disciples, He said, 'Take, eat, this is My body.' In this way the compiler supplied an addition to the actual words spoken by the Lord, that was needful to justify the later practice to which he had become accustomed.

But we are as yet only on the threshold of the argument. We will consider more fully the supposition that our Lord meant by the words spoken, 'This *bread* is My body.' Against this construction of the passage are the conflicting genders of *τοῦτο* and *ἄρτος*; the first is neuter, the second is masculine. The two words cannot be connected together grammatically. The word *ἄρτος* occurs some ninety-nine times in the New Testament. In not less than fifty-one of these it is construed with masculine adjuncts. In no case whatever is it found grammatically conjoined with a word in the neuter gender. To talk of any superior attraction of *σῶμα* in this passage, as some grammarians do, is simply begging the question. It is an assumption for which there is no ground, until it can be shown that the words under consideration have no other rational meaning. On the other hand, it is well known that a *complex* idea—as of a union of persons engaged in a common employment or united for a common purpose, like that which Jesus and the twelve were at the time engaged in, of celebrating the Passover, sitting together at a social meal, breaking bread together—requires a neuter pronoun to express it pronominally.*

* Matt. i. 22; ix. 28; xiii. 28; xiv. 2; xv. 11; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56; xxviii. 14. Mark i. 27, 38; v. 21, 43. Luke i. 34; ii. 12, 15; iv. 43; v. 5; vi. 3; x. 28; xii. 18; xvi. 2; xviii. 36; xx. 17; xxiv. 40. John ii. 12, 22; iii. 22; viii. 5; xii. 6, 33; xviii. 37; xix. 28; xx. 22; xxi. 19. Acts ii. 12, 14, 16; ix. 21; xxi. 23; xxvi. 26; Romans x. 8; xii. 20; xiii. 6; xiv. 9.

These references might be extended indefinitely.

This 'breaking of bread together' St. Paul names 'The Lord's Supper.' The two phrases have the same identical meaning. And so, following St. Paul's interpretation of the words, we say that the idea which the Lord had in His mind and intended to express when He spoke the words, 'This is My body for you,' was, This social union of 'breaking bread together to call Me to mind' is My body, for you to become, or to constitute. That this is so is shown by the recorded facts of the Corinthian Supper. What doubt can there be, that if the Apostle's words had been discovered now for the first time, and that the doctrine of Transubstantiation had not held the ground, no other meaning of the words would have been dreamed of than that given by the Apostle? The Church socially uniting in the act of eating the Lord's Supper is the body of Christ.

The word *απος* may signify 'bread' or 'loaf,' or food in general. Let us for the nonce read 'loaf.' 'This loaf is my body for you. Do, or keep or celebrate this loaf in remembrance of Me.' The absurdity of such a meaning admits of no defence. The word 'this' must have another reference. Clearly some other idea enters in. The Apostle supplies *δειπνον* ('supper') to express it. Supper is an evening meal. It has no other meaning. The rite, as now administered, is not a meal in any sense. The words 'ordinance' or 'social union' would serve the purpose. 'This ordinance, this social union, to call Me to mind, which I will animate by My spirit, shall be my body for you. Celebrate this ordinance—this social union, when I am gone from you, to open the door of your hearts to My spirit, and thus, in and by a present Divine human union, call Me to mind. Your celebration of it in this way shall constitute you My body to show forth My spirit to the world, and thus to renew My memory on earth.'

The disciples and the service—the disciples in the

service—are clearly united in the Lord's mind by the use of the word 'this.' The disciples celebrating this ordinance according to the Lord's purpose and intimation, receiving in each celebration a supply of the spirit of Jesus in their hearts, would thus have Him present with them, and would thus call Him to mind by their experience of the fulfilment of His promise that He would not leave them orphans, but come to them as their Divine Saviour. They would thus recall to their minds His great love, His great and finished work, and seek according to their strength and opportunities to show themselves forth as His body, evermore doing His work in the world, by seeking the good of all those amongst whom they lived and worked.

We have now shown conclusively, as we think, that the idea of bread or food cannot of itself supply the necessary meaning to the Lord's words, and so there is nothing to which the words can refer but to 'the breaking of bread,' *i.e.*, its distribution amongst the assembled company and their participation in it. It is as if the Lord said, 'The social feast, celebrated in obedience to My command to bring you into My presence, and so to call Me to mind, shall constitute you My body, My representative body to all generations.' There would have been no *σῶμα* of the Lord possible after His departure from the earth if the company assembled had not been there to represent it.

The formation of 'the Lord's body' always requires two factors.

1. The company of a body of disciples.
2. Their 'breaking bread together'—so uniting them in spirit—with the deliberate purpose of invoking the Lord's presence, and so of calling Him to mind.

These factors in union, which St. Paul names the Lord's Supper, forms the 'Lord's body' to all genera-

tions. And the end in view, 'calling the Lord to mind,' or 'in remembrance of the Saviour,' can only be spiritually accomplished by us, as the Lord Himself is spiritually present with us, endowing us with Divine life and strength to do His work in the world. Any other remembrance of Him, any other calling of Him to mind, would be a mockery of the Lord, and a delusion and a snare to those who trust in it.

There is another consideration worth a passing notice. Where our Lord instituted 'the Cup' as the New Covenant in His own blood, He leaves nothing to be understood as to His reference to the word 'This,' He says *‘τουτο ποτηριον’*—'This Cup is the New Covenant in My blood.' If He had meant to say 'This bread is My body,' would He not have spoken with the same distinctness and said so? Why should He leave the greater and more incomprehensible mystery to be inferred, whilst He fully expresses the simpler relation of 'this' to the Cup by unmistakably conjoining them together?

From this point of view, the Lord's Supper is seen to be the kingdom of God in embryo. Its three watch words are Brotherhood, Human-service and Self-sacrifice, after the example of Christ. All human effort and activity must have these Divine principles for their source and spring and continuous life. The disciple sits down to renew his vows and consecration to the service of love, becoming little by little, and day by day, more and more conformed to the image of Christ, until the Divine Love embodied in the Saviour becomes embodied in the disciple and the Lord Jesus recalled to mind everywhere in the lives of His disciples, who accept Him as their Exemplar and Heavenly guide, and God becomes visibly the All in All of nature and of man. 'Do this to recall Me to mind. Lose yourselves in each other. Love one another as I have loved you.' Whosoever then eats the Lord's bread of union and drinks the

Lord's cup of self-sacrifice proclaims the death of the Lord, who gave Himself to His enemies to His own temporal suffering, that He might enter into humanity and show forth a love stronger than death leading to the eternal salvation of the human race.

Another consideration will close this section.

Paul's doctrine of the Church being the body of Christ is peculiar to him. In none other of the apostolic writings is the idea broached. From whence did the Apostle derive it? Clearly from the words of the Lord, which he thus interpreted. There is no other assignable source for the doctrine. Under God the Apostle's writings will yet be the deliverance of the world from the corruption and travesty of the doctrine of Christ which now permeates the Christian world.

APPENDIX D, pages 64, 75.

Evochos.—‘He who shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, or unfittingly, will be “enochos” of the body and blood of the Lord.’

It is impossible to express at once, simply and clearly, the meaning and special idea of the Greek word *ἐνοχος* in this passage. The word has no analogue or synonym in the English language; and the idea it conveyed to the Corinthian reader can scarcely be said to have an existence in the popular English mind. The word ordinarily expresses the relation which a man, whose guilt has been already proved, bears to the tribunal which has convicted him, before sentence is passed upon him. The nearest English expression of the idea is, perhaps, ‘the prisoner at the bar,’ and the nearest English literal translation of the passage would be something in this form: ‘He who shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily—in a disorderly

manner—will render himself liable to the judgment of the body and blood of the Lord.’

But it may help the English reader, in his attempt to realize the Apostle’s idea, if he regards the word as directly opposite in meaning to ‘*koinonia*.’ If we could coin a new Greek word ‘*enokonia*,’ this would be the exact opposite.

Let the reader figure to himself ‘*koinonia*’ as representing a living spiritual union of men and women effected by the action of a Divine *centripetal* force, (in this case) bringing the Christian brotherhood at the table into a spiritual vortex of union with the Lord Jesus Christ; whilst the unworthy communicant joining outwardly in the same service, by his disorderly conduct, brings into action a *centrifugal* force that divides the assembly, in the place of uniting it; that whirls the members asunder instead of bringing them together; and that the Apostle regards the body and blood of the Lord as divine, living, intelligent spiritual principles; and so regarded as the tribunal of judgment before which the offender will have to stand, and have judgment pronounced against him—sickness or death, as the case may be—and the Apostle’s meaning will be fairly realized.

The orthodox translation of this passage of the Epistle, ‘shall be *guilty* of the body and blood of the Lord,’ presents the most astonishing instance and illustration of traditional interpretation overriding all regard to the meaning of the words, and at the same time all regard to common-sense, that the history of Christian literature offers to our notice.

‘Guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.’ This collocation of words has no meaning, and never had a meaning in the English language. Try it by comparison: ‘Guilty of the body and blood of the Queen of England.’

A man can only be *guilty* of crime, of some transgression of law. Had the expression been ‘guilty of

profaning,' it would be rational enough. But there is not a word about profanation in the whole passage. And clearly we have no right to add words to what the Apostle wrote to make sense, until we have exhausted all rational methods of interpretation of the words which he did make use of.

Let us examine the subject carefully.

The word *ἔνοχος*—'enochos,' here translated 'guilty,' occurs ten times in the New Testament; four times in Matt. v. 21, 22, translated in the Revised Version 'in danger of;' once in Matt. xxvi. 66; once in Mark xiv. 64; and once in Hebrews ii. 15, translated 'subject to;' once in Mark iii. 29; and again in James ii. 10, and in the passage before us translated 'guilty of.' It is thus evident that we have no word or single phrase in the English language that is the equivalent of 'enochos' in the Greek.

To get an adequate idea of its meaning, we must, therefore, look to its derivation. It comes from *ἐνέχω*, 'to hold or keep fast within,' 'to hold in bonds,' 'to be in the power of another's will,' and so 'to be subject to, or liable to,' 'to be held in control under;' *e.g.*, as a slave to the will of his master, or as a criminal under sentence of law; and its applicative meaning depends on the nature or quality or purpose of the holding, or restraining power. But its usual meaning seems to be 'to be held in,' for the purpose of punishment or corrective discipline, and perhaps the nearest English phrase to express such meaning is 'to be held in the grip of' some stronger power for control or judgment;—to be held in bonds or fetters.

Anyone who will take the trouble to examine the passages referred to will see that this idea is common to the whole of them.

In Matthew v. 21, 22, the man who gives way to anger is 'in the grip of'—*i.e.*, cannot escape from the judgment of—'the Gehenna of fire.' In Matthew xxvi. 66 and Mark xiv. 64, when the crowd call for

the crucifixion of Jesus, and by popular vote, as it were, adjudge Him to death, guilt, as of law transgressed, is not expressed. The hope of saving their popular hero, Barabbas, excited them against Jesus, and when this hope was seen to be general the demand was made and the sentence given, 'Let Him be held in the grip of death.'

In Hebrews ii. 15, it is said that Jesus Himself 'partook of flesh and blood, that through death He might deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage;' *i.e.*, held in the grip of Satan, which is the bondage spoken of.

In James ii. 10, the translation of 'enochos' by 'guilty' gives a sense so false and ludicrous that it is hard to conceive how so many able men, as the Revision was committed to, could have been blind to it. The translators, by translating 'enochos' in this passage 'guilty,' make St. James to say, in effect, that 'Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one command, becomes guilty of all,' a statement which unmistakably conveys the idea that he who steals a penny is guilty of murder, adultery, and breaking the Sabbath. Surely no sane man could have fancied such an idea as they describe St. James to have seriously written. The meaning of St. James's own words is clear, simple, and rational. His position is that the law of God is one law, the expression of one Divine will; and so that whosoever transgresses the least of God's commands brings himself 'within the grip' of that unitary and universal principle of truth and righteousness which is the Divine rule of judgment. This idea is open to no just criticism. But then such expression of it affords no justification for translating 'enochos' by 'guilty' in 1 Cor. xi. 27.

In Mark iii. 29 the preceding observations do not apply with equal force; but still, even here, though the word 'guilty' does not stand self-condemned, as

in James ii. 10, it does not adequately represent the original idea. The Revised Version reads thus : 'Whoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin'—a sin that cannot have forgiveness, that cannot be forgiven ; *i.e.*, holds him guilty of it, in the grip of an eternally sinful state.

The forgiveness of sin is always represented in the New Testament as resulting from faith in Christ ; and this faith opens the believer to a new and Divine life—the inflowing of the Holy Spirit, the earnest of the Christian's redemption—as the Divine witness of the truth of the promises of the Gospel, and of the believer's interest in them. This gift of the Holy Spirit comes to him as a member of the body of Christ, and is 'Christ in him the hope of glory,' creating him anew, by a Divine operation, in the image of God, delivering him from the power of sin, and imparting the Divine strength needful for growth in righteousness, in the true Christian life.

The wilful rejection, therefore, of this Divine influence, which is absolutely needful for his personal regeneration, and which rejection is involved in 'blaspheming against the Holy Spirit,' shuts the man guilty of it out of the pale of Christ's salvation, and so leaves him hopelessly in 'the grip' of sin—of the evil principle in him, which alienates him from everything that is holy, as long as the age endures. Theft, murder, adultery—indeed, all other forms of sin—of necessity cease when the sinner is brought under the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit ; but he who rejects this influence, by the very rejection shuts himself out from the possibility of pardon and peace with God, because he wilfully continues in a state of personal hostility to the only Divine and regenerating principle by which he can be saved.

The word 'enochos,' here, as everywhere else in the New Testament, means 'forcibly held fast in the grip

of' something or other for ultimate judgment, from which there is no escape.

He who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit is 'held fast in the grip of eternal sin'—an evil principle that is eternally opposed to, and that eternally rejects the salvation of Christ, and so becomes the subject of the Divine judgment.

It is thus clear that all logical applications of the word 'enochos' are derived from this central idea of 'subjection to' or of 'control by' a dominant power, bringing judgment in its train, and the whole scope of the passage in St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 26 to the end of the chapter) is in harmony with this general idea—that the unworthy communicant having become a member of the Church—the body of Christ—is held in spite of his unworthiness in the spiritual power, embodied in the Church, for corrective judgment, and so for ultimate salvation; and that partaking of the Lord's Supper, so far as it is the bond of outward Christian union in the Church, unites the disciple to his Lord, as a member is united to the body; and that though he may be unconscious of this union to his Saviour, or conscious, without seeking to realize it as he ought; and though the act of unworthily—that is, of ignorantly, unfittingly, and without intelligent purpose—partaking of the Supper and the Cup, leads to many evil consequences; yet this alone cannot separate from the love of Christ, who mercifully chastens His disciples for their offences, but will not finally condemn them with the unbelieving world. A perusal of the verses following (30-32) shows beyond doubt that this is the meaning of the Apostle. And a further reference to 1 Cor. v. 3-6 will perhaps throw some additional light on the judgment spoken of.

CONCLUSION.

WE propose here to state succinctly the general conclusions at which we have arrived; and the Apostle's final instruction in regard to the celebration of the Lord's Supper to the Church at Corinth.

(1) That the Lord's Supper is not an ecclesiastical rite or sacrament, requiring a priest for its celebration, but a common meal to be partaken of at a common table by all members of the Christian Church to express their common brotherhood and sisterhood in Christ.

(2) That the Apostle Paul nowhere teaches that, in partaking of the Supper, the partakers, in any sense, were eating the body or drinking the blood of Christ.

(3) That it is probable that the food, or dishes of food, which formed the supper, were the voluntary offerings of members of the Church.

(4) That the table on which the gifts were placed, and round which the company sat, was recognised by the Church as the LORD'S Table; and thanksgiving being offered up by all present, the food by such act was consecrated to the Lord, and so became (*εις ατρος*, 1 Cor. x. 17) the common property of the whole Church, for the celebration of the service.

(5) That each one of the company waited to be helped by some brother or sister near him, all being givers and all receivers in turn, in obedience to the Lord's injunction—'Do this to call Me to mind.'

(6) That the service required a loving, unselfish heart and spirit for its celebration.

(7) That any assumption of individual proprietary right, or of special personal control over the gift, on the part of the giver, after its consecration, was an offence against the Church and the Lord.

(8) Such offence the Apostle describes by the word *προλαμβάνω*, which may be translated 'pre-appropriate,' and which may signify either keeping back the gift during the preparatory service; or declining or refusing to allow its common use by other members of the Church as an expression on their part of Christian brotherhood.

(9) This also is the offence which the Apostle describes in the 27th verse, as eating the bread or drinking the cup of the Lord, *αναξίως*, translated in the Authorized Version 'unworthily,' *i.e.* thoughtlessly, profanely, or irreverently. This offence makes the offender *ἔνοχος* of the body and blood of the Lord, and he becomes at once incapable of receiving any spiritual benefit from the service, but, contrariwise, will receive judgment.

(10) The Apostle, therefore, teaches that it behoves everyone to 'test himself,' 'prove himself by trial,' whether he be fit, *viz.*, by the possession of a loving heart towards all his brethren and towards the Lord, to sit down at the table; as it was only by such examination that he could escape the evil consequences of sickness and death, which had followed the offence in many instances.

(11) The Apostle, however, offers this comfort to surviving relatives and friends, that in such cases the punishment was only a present chastening of the Lord; that those who suffered should not hereafter be finally condemned with the unbelieving world.

(12) And he concludes with injunctions binding on all who recognise his Apostolic authority: 'When ye come together to eat, *ἐκδέχεσθε*, GIVE and RECEIVE from each other; and if anyone hunger let him eat at home, that ye come not together for condemnation.'

THE END.

Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row, London.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

48149454

BV
823
R6
1894

**THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CA
91711**

03/02
DEMCO

